

Nothing left now but . . .



Or to Arms.

The Modern Militiaman's Internet Gazette

March 6, 1998, Issue #10-98

ABC's of Destruction -- Aryans, BioWar, & Clinton

Purpose: Our purpose is to serve the Resistance/Patriot Movement as an occasional gazette providing news and commentary favorable to our Cause in a format accessible to the general public.

The news from e-mail listings is shown in preformatted text. This news will be attributed to its authors/editors and is entirely the opinion of that particular author/editor.

One of the reasons for this is to cut down on the spamming and foolishness inherent in raw e-mail in order to provide a forum for discussion of Resistance Movement issues.

Commentary is in regular format and is solely the opinions of the Editor and Staff of *Modern Militiaman Internet Gazette*.

Editor [Martin Lindstedt](#)

Fable of Contents

1. [This Issue's Editorial Commentary](#)
2. [Principles of Biological Warfare](#) -- by Martin Lindstedt
3. [Back to the Bay of Camels](#) -- Eric Margolis of *The Toronto Sun*
4. [Evil Empire Has Internal Dialogue Regarding Its Eventual Destruction](#) -- from the CFR rag [Foreign Affairs](#) by Richard K. Betts, CFR wonk
5. [Let 'Em Live In Fear](#) -- by Leonard Pitts, Jacksonville [Florida] Daily News
6. [We Educated Our Enemies to Destroy Us, Iraq's Dr. Germ](#) -- Melbourne [Australia] Herald Sun
7. [Origins of Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction](#) -- Reuters, 02/12/98
8. [Fight One Dog, You Gotta Fight 'Em All](#) -- U.S. News & World Report, 02/23/98
- 9.A. [Proof of U.S. False Arrests & Propaganda in Anthrax "Plot"](#) -- Michael Johnson
- 9.B. [Just Suppose](#) -- Brad Metcalf
- 10.A. [Of Anthrax and "Aryans"](#) -- The Hoffmann Wire of 02/20/98
- 10.B. [The Conspiracy Against Larry Wayne Harris](#) -- Terry W. Strough
11. [Common-Sense Evacuation of Biowar-Contaminated Areas](#) -- Deep013
12. [Return Fire! Letters to the Editor](#)
13. [Further Links for More Information](#)

The Biological War Inevitable, Part II

Back in July of 1997 in the [Modern Militiaman's Internet Gazette #7-97](#), I predicted that biological warfare was indeed inevitable. We are now eight months closer to that inevitability. Back then, there were rumors of biological warfare plottings on the part of the U.S. regime, the Iranians, and the various anti-government groups that formed in response to the U.S. regime's criminal tyrannical activities. The same rumors still fly, concerning the same players, but the basis for these rumors have since been revealed to be horribly altogether so true. **Anybody** can use and successfully deploy biological warfare agents.

We forget that biological warfare has been with us for a long time. The Black Death that ravaged Europe in 1348-1351 has been traced to the Mongols catapulting corpses in a town they had besieged in the Crimea in 1348. Ships evacuating the town carried the Bubonic Plague to Italy, thence to Spain, France, Germany, England, Scandinavia, where it took at least one-third of the population, sometimes more. American whiskey traders sometimes deliberately sold smallpox blankets to the non-immune Indians, to clear the proposed settlement of their tribal lands. The Assyrians are credited with biological warfare as well, as far back as the 7th Century B.C.E.

Yet these efforts are crude compared to the age of biological weapons which lie ahead. The atomic bomb, with which we were concerned with when we were fighting communism, is but the outgrowth of physics, a science thought up in the last half of the 19th Century and perfected within the first half of the 20th Century. The limits of nuclear weaponry is that for all practical purpose they are but the outgrowth of gunpowder weapons. Yes, a nuclear weapon has a substantially larger bang than the largest cannon can deliver, but in its applications by military men have been treated substantially as blast and bombing weapons superior only in its scope to conventional explosives, as witness its delivery by aircraft, missile, or even by cannon.

Biology concerns itself with the science of life. The science of life can be harnessed to be the science of death -- human death -- as the smallest forms of life are unleashed to form agents of death against humanity. All it takes is but the will to do so, as the science of life has progressed with the invention of genetic technology to where new pathogens can be brought into being by gene-splicing, the creation of new deadly forms of life, as opposed to the 60 year-old method of breeding natural pathogens such as anthrax to serve biological warfare.

Yet both the subtle methods of biological warfare, such as gene-splicing viruses such as ebola and smallpox, and the crude methods, such as collecting natural anthrax spores and culturing them by exposure to antibiotics to create military-grade anthrax immune to all known antibiotics, are possible today. Countries such as the former U.S.S.R and the present U.S.S.A. have created super-viruses while Third-World countries such as Iraq are stuck with culturing anthrax or indigenous camel pox, and aggrieved and restive populations of these tyrannical countries consider, then implement culturing crude, but effective natural anthrax spores. The United States develops the biological equivalent of the mini-gatling gun, while the U.S.S.R and China have 50 cal. machineguns, Iraq has an AK-47, and aggrieved elements of these tyrannical regimes have acquired bolt-actions and flintlocks aimed at their home regimes' backs. All these hostile elements are locked together, hating one another, within a firing range of an acre. Given all the weaponry involved, and the measure of hatred, it is but a matter of time before the shooting starts and almost everyone is killed. The very first shot is guaranteed to kill, and the subsequent shots are no less lethal.

So what is lacking is a mastery of the political forms given this new reality. The current old politics of tyranny rested firmly on gunpowder weaponry wherein political power grew out of the barrel of a gun, and given enough guns absolute political power was assured. The gunpowder weaponry to enforce terror favored the terror of the masses against the individual or smaller grouping, and the better organized the masses were in using gunpowder weaponry, the better the political will of the rulers of these political masses could be enforced.

Edged weaponry, and the age of feudalism, were destroyed by the usages of gunpowder. Where feudalism still existed at the turn of the century, it ended up being destroyed by the modern nation-state at the turn of the 19th Century. The British, with their political organization of constitutional monarchy butchered from afar with Maxim and rifle fire the spear-armed squares of Fuzzy-Wuzzies, ruled by kings and prophets in the Sudan around 1895. The Italians, with their dictatorship of Mussolini machine-gunned entire regiments of spear-chucking Ethiopians of the feudalistic Haile Selassie. So we can see that weaponry -- the means of enforcing government coercion -- shapes the political shape of the nation, whose ruling classes always reserve unto themselves a monopoly of force. Edged weapons brought about feudalism. Gunpowder brought about the modern nation-state.

But what form of regime does biological weaponry bring about? What political changes are brought about by biological weaponry?

Biological weaponry can be made by very small groups of people, or even just one person acting alone. The value of the masses is negated absolutely in favor of brainpower of the individual. One individual, working alone, and in secret, can create a weapon of mass destruction. And by working alone, and in secret, that one individual can strike at any time, undetected, and carry out his will. The monopoly of violence, the balance of terror has thus shifted to the launcher of a shot which comes out of the dark. Since political power is measured by the ability to exercise force, and force is derived from the willingness and ability to use violence and create terror, the structure of the social order will/must change because it has no other choice.

No future society will be able to maintain a big government. In the prophetic words of Frank Herbert in his 1982 novel *The White Plague*, a biologist says:

"Of what use is a big government when a single individual can destroy it? Governments will have to be small enough where you know every one of your neighbors. . . . But who would dare attack his neighbor when one survivor can exterminate the attackers. . . . Who would dare maintain a military force when the possession of such a force is an invitation to disaster, keeping your populace in constant peril? Your military forces cannot practice its arts upon its neighbors. The old weapons are outmoded."

Even the Russian scientist in the book knows that his social order, a relatively efficient police state, cannot work in the new reality, because what happens if you shoot the wrong scientists? Or the plague mutates? Or another plague is created by other nationalities' scientists? Who then, will create the vaccine?

So the new biological weaponry, in addition to outmoding the old gunpowder/atomic weaponry has destroyed the political basis behind all current social orders. Biological weaponry, striking at unprepared civilian populations will rip right through them just as Hitler's machine-gun armed panzers destroyed the charging Polish cavalry. The regime that ill-leads its obsolete military machine to destruction will be overthrown, just as the Polish government was replaced after its unconditional surrender and partition in 1939. So too, will be the foolish Clinton regime, starting a foreign war against Iraq and all its Arab brethren and its Pan-Islamic fundamentalist allies who regard it as the Great Satan. Meanwhile, internal dissent will turn deadly, as aggrieved anti-regime forces create, then use, crude biological weaponry against the police state that murders and oppresses them.

So in this new reality, the necessity for wisdom and justice in both foreign and domestic policies becomes the *sine qua non* for survival. Yet while the necessity of civilized and lawful behavior on the part of the ruling elites becomes greater and greater, the supply is nonexistent. Clinton's toying with disaster with the Iraqis, and the moronic majority of Republican kongress-kritters ensure that foreign policy regarding the biologically-armed Iraq and its allies is equivalent to the behavior of a malicious five-year-old bully armed with a submachinegun wanting to stomp the heads in of a den of rattlesnakes. Sooner or later the little monster is going to get bit -- regardless of how many snakes get shredded by bullets. And for what? So a morally degenerate and politically bankrupt mass herd of Amerikan mattoids can get their feeble-minded interest off Slick Willie's spittle-slicked willie? Never before has so much been risked by so many for so few.

In domestic policy, the lives of the amoral majority are hostage to the actions of a police state run by the Keystone Kops in favor of the criminal injustice system. Remember, it only takes a fanatic copying a page off the Larry Wayne Harris School of Microbiology to destroy Hillary's village.

But regrettably, surveying the state of the current social order and the rottenness of the decayed political elites running it towards its destruction, anyone with a clear mind's-eye to see reality knows that the situation is hopeless. The need for change is several orders of magnitude beyond the ability to change to meet the new conditions for social survival. The task would be daunting enough if the social order was in good shape -- **but it is not**. Our civilization cannot be saved, not in its present form, not with the load of degenerates swamping the lifeboats.

For close to two years now, I have urged the Resistance and Patriotic elements to form survival cells of close friends and family. I continue to make that rational plea of sanity. For those who do not believe it is bad as I say, I offer the below issue of easily verifiable material for them to peruse and to see for themselves. The policies which should be set by all Resistance cells are those common-sense solutions which will lead to: (1) Survival and (2) Freedom. Survival comes first because you cannot enjoy your Freedom unless you are alive to enjoy it. So when biological warfare comes, I urge you to be out of the cities and in a place of isolation from a diseased and dying mass humanity. That you have enough food, water, and shelter in an isolated location. That you have enough moral strength to protect your own from the dying clench of the unprepared who would take from you your self-prepared means for survival. This might even mean that you might go so far in your own protection as to consider fighting fire with fire.

Every man to his tent, O Israel! We will meet, in our separate tribes before the ark of the covenant when this is all over to discuss the basis for a voluntary confederation of men of good will for the purposes of justice.

--Editor [Martin Lindstedt](#)

.

.



.

Military Grade Anthrax & Its Usages

Someone wrote:

```
>Does anyone have a reference defining "military-grade anthrax"?  
>Nothing showed up in an Altavista Web search.  
>
```

>Could the newspapers be referring to weaponized anthrax?

>

>

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

In the sorting of electronic components, such as diodes and resistors, the gold band after the first three is to denote a military specification, such as within 5 percent, as opposed to the silver band, which is commercial grade and thus within 10% tolerance.

In the case of biological agents, I would say that military-grade anthrax is a strain which has a pedigree, having been cultivated and specifically bred for a military application, as opposed to 'natural' strains which can be found in the soil where domestic animals died of anthrax, and the bacilli had opportunity to strengthen their cell walls and hibernate into spore form. Supposedly, Harris took a probe and got anthrax spores by such a method. These spores can be found anywhere in places like South Dakota or Texas which were known as 'anthrax districts.' In fact, [in a Modern Militiaman's Internet Gazette of last year, I reprinted a story from the Souix Falls Argus-Leader about an anthrax outbreak](#) around Mitchell, South Dakota, which had killed two cattle herds as a result of the unusually moist conditions of last year. [Correction: It was in an e-mail posting, which I think was posted to a listserver. Last July the wires were burning over a supposed biowar which didn't happen.]

See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Lobby/1076/mmgaz7.html>

It would seem reasonable that a military grade anthrax would be bred and tested to ensure lethality much in the same way Herefords are bred for special characteristics and the way nuclear warheads have been tested to ensure a maximum bang for a given amount of plutonium.

You see, biological warfare is the wave of the future because it is cheap, easily available to anyone who really wants to develop such weapons, and its defense is created as a useful byproduct adjunct to developing such offensive weapons. In fact, if you wish to develop a vaccine to the military grade anthrax, you must culture the strain to which you wish to create those antibodies (or antibiotics).

Remember, anthrax is a naturally occurring bacillus which has been used as the template for almost all biological warfare experiments. It is the original stock, like the wolf is for everything from wolfdogs to little Mexican hairless dogs whose name I can't spell.

So one gets some anthrax spores from natural sources. From that, one cultures the spores, then exposes that culture to antibiotics. The antibiotics will kill most of the anthrax culture, but what survives is now antibiotic resistant, then immune to that particular antibiotic. (For example, there are some strains of tuberculosis bacilli which prefer to eat streptomycin FIRST, before feeding upon the normal culture medium.) What anthrax strains die off, are not destroyed, are used for the development of a vaccine to be used for inoculation before the live antibiotic-resistant anthrax strain faces the next hurdle of a new test with a more potent antibiotic.

Eventually, given a few weeks, months, years, the last antibiotic left, such as vancomycin, is breached in its effectiveness as prophylactic against a biological warfare agent. However, at the same time, the vaccine for this superior anthrax strain has been developed as a defense in tandem with a military offense. Thus the developer of the offensive biological agent has the advantage of creating its defense, and thus can wage offensive biological warfare at will upon defenseless populations. This is the logic behind the

military uses of biological warfare, and would be what I would call 'military-grade' anthrax. It would be an anthrax with a pedigree, specifically bred to overcome civilian sector commercial antibiotics (which due to their overuse by agribusiness are increasingly worthless in combatting native bacilli such as streptococcus) and to which there is a vaccine available for injection by those chosen to survive.

When one includes gene-splicing technology available for useage by the regime, all manner of exotic baccilli can be created, such as an artificial strep-anthrax-plague bacilli, which could be used as a doomsday device or for further blackmail. Of course, I would call such an artificial organism 'super-military-grade anthrax derivative,' but any way you sliced it, it still would be guaranteed death in a bottle.

When one realizes that our own criminal regime has been experimenting with such pathogens since before WWII, and has both the criminal intent to make such weapons and the will to use them, one should be far more scared of 'our' gubbnmint's military-grade anthrax, as it has had a longer headstart than anything which has been bred by the Iraqis who have probably only been at it for 15 years, or a Larry Wayne Harris special, which in terms of effectiveness is but the crude derivation of natural anthrax.

In any case given the immorality and stupidity of the current idiotic criminal regime, it is indeed but a matter of time before (1) They start a war with some state or group with the willingness to use biological warfare or (2) They pull an OKC and poison-death some mid-range city and blame it on the militia or 'patriots' or Iraqis or whomever else is the enemy of the criminal regime that season. In any case, the target will likely be some major political or economic center such as a big city. Washington or New York in the case of aggrieved parties from #1; Baton Rouge or Houston or Tulsa in the case of the criminal regime wanting to spread panic and to protect itself from internal disruption by totalitarian imposition in scenario #2.

Of course the efforts of a dying criminal regime to maintain power through a policy of 'limited' biological warfare will backfire. Biological warfare is here to stay, and it simply cannot be protected against given the current state of scientific knowledge, the numbers of aggrieved parties wishing for revenge for past injustices, and the vulnerabilities inherent in having masses of low-quality humanity crowded together in megalopolises and the fact that due to the overuse of antibiotics by agribusiness that there is no pool of people with natural immunity to the actions of biological warfare. The era of artificial immunity is drawing to a close with vancomycin-resistant bacteria signalling an end to the past 50-year over-exploitation of earth-based anti-bacilli of the streptomycin family.

The only defense against biowar is to enforce a strict isolation in favor of one's self and family by eliminating all sources of infection and having the resources to live in isolation until the biowar has run its course. In other words, this entails living in a small town or rural area, being willing to shoot to kill anyone coming within an infection zone by straying off public thoroughfares, and having enough food and other supplies to stay put until the pandemic is over. Since antibiotics will be useless and it is foolish to bet that you are the one person in 100 with a natural genetic immunity to whatever pathogen is used, such a policy of defense from contagion is the only one possible.

The Resistance Action Force cells out there must consider the discreet development of biological agents for the following

reasons:

- (1) Every totalitarian regime out there has developed or is developing biowar agents for the overt purpose of Mutual Assured Destruction and the covert purpose of having a first-strike capability in order to advance their criminal activities against perceived enemies, foreign and domestic. Since by their criminal activities these regimes and their culpable citizenry have forfeited their right to live, the usage of biological weaponry for past and continuing injustices against them is not an immoral act.
- (2) Biological warfare is cheap, effective, easy, and undetectable. There is no way it can be guarded against. Placing an airtight cordon around a major city 24 hours per day for years on end is impossible, given the need for its resupply with food and other essentials of life. Driving a car on the interstate beltway around every major city in Amerika with a fake tailpipe pumping anthrax spores upwind is a piece of cake given a suicide driver or someone properly vaccinated against the pathogen.
- (3) Biological warfare is such that the only defense other than quarantine is to be the only one holding the vaccine to the pathogen unleashed. This vaccine can be administered to one's allies and denied to the victims unless they accede to one's will. Thus a tactical and strategic necessity of biowar is to ALWAYS be the one engaged in a first strike.
- (4) Biological warfare always favors the aggrieved who have far less to lose. While no person has more than one life, taking down a criminal regime and its human herd animals who allowed it to flourish wallowing in injustice can be said to be an effective revenge, and thus a life effectively spent. In any case, such revenge being taken is but a matter of time given that the current criminal regime is a never-ending fountain of injustice generating masses of the aggrieved.
- (5) Since a large portion of Resistance Action Forces are of Christian Identity and/or White Nationalist persuasion and live in the rural areas most defensible to biowar, and the favored minorities of the criminal regime and the regime criminals themselves live in the urban and suburban areas most susceptible to biowar attack, it would be foolish not to use a weapon which favors our side. Logic dictates that in the absence of any true faith and allegiance between opposing sides that tactical and strategic advantages will be pursued relentlessly in the interests of winning the coming biowar. All things considered, it is far safer to unleash biowar rather than have it unleashed against your side.

Larry Wayne Harris does indeed come off as a psychotic on the TV tube such as occurred on [Diane Sawyer's ABC program](#) on Feb. 25, 1998; however his snigger concerning the usage of biowar tactics by unknown Resistance cells reflects realities. Unknown cells using crudely bred anthrax spores are indeed invincible, and Mr. Harris, be he psycho or unwilling FiBBle stooge, has accurately glimpsed the future. Mr. Harris may not be the George Washington of the biowar revolution, but he is intelligent enough to be a prophet glimpsing the reality of the times to come.

Morality has absolutely nothing to do with the deployment of biological weaponry. The time for morality was back before the current immorality made civil warfare inevitable.

Anyone in the Resistance movement who cannot take the above realities to heart should waste his time in church praying for peace between men of ill will. The Resistance needs to develop some of this weaponry in order to deal with the current ruling criminal regime and also to deal with potential invasion when civil- and bio-warfare has decimated the vast majority of Amerika. I would urge anyone who loves his own to keep in mind the above realities

of offensive biological warfare or at the very least the limited pitiful and beleaguered defense against it .

--Martin Lindstedt

P.S. I am not an expert in this field. However, confirmation of the facts cited above can be discerned by reading some general information concerning biology in a high-skrule textbook, an adequate encyclopedia (I have Compton's on CD-ROM), and a few general non-fiction books on the subject such as 1990's *"The Coming Plague."* Even fiction such as Stephen King's *"The Stand"*, Frank Herbert's *"The White Plague"* or especially Michael Crichton's *"The Lost World"* can be informative. -M.L.

.

.

Back to the Bay of Camels

.

Date: Wed, 18 Feb 1998 17:48:37 -0500
From: MID-EAST REALITIES <http://WWW.MiddleEast.Org>.

M I D - E A S T R E A L I T I E S

(c) Copyright 1998

MER may be freely distributed by email and on the Internet so long as there is no editing of any kind. For any print publication, permission in writing is required.

MER@MiddleEast.Org / Fax: 202 362-6965 / Phone: 202 362-5266

.

.

Evil Empire Has Internal Dialogue Regarding Its Eventual Destruction

.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS -January/February 1998
www.foreignaffairs.org

THE PRIMARY DANGER IS THAT AN ENEMY MIGHT TRIGGER A CATASTROPHE IN AN AMERICAN CITY -- The New Threat of Mass Destruction

Richard K. Betts

WHAT IF MCVEIGH HAD USED ANTHRAX?

DURING THE Cold War, weapons of mass destruction were the centerpiece of foreign policy. Nuclear arms hovered in the background of every

major issue in East-West competition and alliance relations. The highest priorities of U.S. policy could almost all be linked in some way to the danger of World War III and the fear of millions of casualties in the American homeland.

Since the Cold War, other matters have displaced strategic concerns on the foreign policy agenda, and that agenda itself is now barely on the public's radar screen. Apart from defense policy professionals, few Americans still lose sleep over weapons of mass destruction (WMD). After all, what do normal people feel is the main relief provided by the end of the Cold War? It is that the danger of nuclear war is off their backs.

Yet today WMD present more and different things to worry about than during the Cold War. For one, nuclear arms are no longer the only concern, as chemical and biological weapons have come to the fore. For another, there is less danger of complete annihilation, but more danger of mass destruction. Since the Cold War is over and American and Russian nuclear inventories are much smaller, there is less chance of an apocalyptic exchange of many thousands of weapons. But the probability that some smaller number of WMD will be used is growing. Many of the standard strategies and ideas for coping with WMD threats are no longer as relevant as they were when Moscow was the main adversary. But new thinking has not yet congealed in as clear a form as the Cold War concepts of nuclear deterrence theory.

The new dangers have not been ignored inside the Beltway. "Counterproliferation" has become a cottage industry in the Pentagon and the intelligence community, and many worthwhile initiatives to cope with threats are under way. Some of the most important implications of the new era, however, have not yet registered on the public agenda. This in turn limits the inclination of politicians to push some appropriate programs. Even the defense establishment has directed its attention toward countering threats WMD pose to U.S. military forces op, abroad rather than to the more worrisome danger that mass destruction will occur in the United States, killing large numbers of civilians.

The points to keep in mind about the new world of mass destruction are the following. First, the roles such weapons play in international conflict are changing. They no longer represent the technological frontier of warfare. Increasingly, they will be weapons of the weak-states or groups that militarily are at best second-class. The importance of the different types among them has also shifted. Biological weapons should now be the most serious concern, with nuclear weapons second and chemicals a distant third.

Second, the mainstays of Cold War security policy-deterrence and arms control-are not what they used to be. Some new threats may not be deferrable, and the role of arms control in dealing with WMD has been marginalized. In a few instances, continuing devotion to deterrence and arms control may have side effects that offset the benefits.

Third, some of the responses most likely to cope with the threats in novel ways will not find a warm welcome. The response that should now be the highest priority is one long ignored, opposed, or ridiculed: a serious civil defense program to blunt the effects of if they are unleashed within the United States. Some of the most effective measures to prevent attacks within the United States may also challenge Traditional civil liberties if pursued to the maximum. And the most troubling conclusion for foreign policy as a whole is that reducing the odds of attacks in the United States might require pulling back from involvement in some foreign conflicts. American activism to guarantee international stability is, paradoxically,

the prime source of American vulnerability.

This was partly true in the Cold War, when the main danger that nuclear weapons might detonate on U.S. soil sprang from strategic engagement in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East to deter attacks on U.S. allies. But engagement then assumed a direct link between regional stability and U.S. survival. The connection is less evident today, when there is no globally threatening superpower or transnational ideology to be contained -- only an array of serious but entirely local disruptions. Today, as the only nation acting to police areas outside its own region, the United States makes itself a target for states or groups whose aspirations are frustrated by U.S. power.

FROM MODERN TO PRIMITIVE

The primary risk is that enemies might trigger catastrophes in American cities.

WHEN NUCLEAR weapons were born, they represented the most advanced military applications of science, technology, and engineering. None but the great powers could hope to obtain them. By now, however, nuclear arms have been around for more than half a century, and chemical and biological weapons even longer. They are not just getting old. In the strategic terms most relevant to American security, they have become primitive. Once the military cutting edge of the strong, they have become the only hope for so-called rogue states or terrorists who want to contest American power. Why? Because the United States has developed overwhelming superiority in conventional military force something it never thought it had against the Soviet Union.

The Persian Gulf War of 1991 demonstrated the American advantage in a manner that stunned many abroad. Although the U.S. defense budget has plunged, other countries are not closing the gap. U.S. military spending remains more than triple that of any potentially hostile power and higher than the combined defense budgets of Russia, China, Iran, Iraq, North Korea, and Cuba.

More to the point, there is no evidence that those countries' level of military professionalism is rising at a rate that would make them competitive even if they were to spend far more on their forces. Rolling along in what some see as a revolution in military affairs, American forces continue to make unmatched use of state-of-the-art weapons, surveillance and information systems, and the organizational and doctrinal flexibility for managing the integration of these complex innovations into "systems of systems" that is the key to modern military effectiveness. More than ever in military history, brains are brawn. Even if hostile countries somehow catch up in an arms race, their military organizations and cultures are unlikely to catch up in the competence race for management, technology assimilation, and combat command skills.

If it is infeasible for hostile states to counter the United States in conventional combat, in American cities, it is even more daunting for smaller groups such as terrorists. If the United States is lucky, the various violent groups with grievances against the American government and society will continue to think up schemes using conventional explosives. Few terrorist groups have shown an interest in inflicting true mass destruction. Bombings or hostage seizures have generally threatened no more than a few hundred lives. Let us hope that this limitation has been due to a powerful underlying reason, rather than a simple lack of capability, and that the few exceptions do not become more typical.

There is no sure reason to bet on such restraint. Indeed, some have tried to use WMD, only to see them fizzle. The Japanese Aum Shinrikyo cult released sarin nerve gas in Tokyo in 1995 but killed only a few people, and some analysts believe that those who attacked the World Trade Center in 1993 laced their bomb with cyanide, which burned up in the explosion (this was not confirmed, but a large amount of cyanide was found in the perpetrators' possession). Eventually such a group will prove less incompetent. If terrorists decide that they want to stun American policymakers by inflicting enormous damage, WMD become more attractive at the same time that they are becoming more accessible.

Finally, unchallenged military superiority has shifted the attention of the U.S. military establishment away from WMD. During the Cold War, nuclear weapons were the bedrock of American war capabilities. They were the linchpin of defense debate, procurement programs, and arms control because the United States faced another superpower --one that conventional wisdom feared could best it in conventional warfare. Today, no one cares about the MX missile or B-1 bomber, and hardly anyone really cares about the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. In a manner that could only have seemed ludicrous during the Cold War, proponents now rationalize the \$2 billion B-2 as a weapon for conventional war. Hardly anyone in the Pentagon is still interested in how the United States could use WMD for its own strategic purposes.

What military planners are interested in is how to keep adversaries from using WMD as an "asymmetric" means to counter U.S. conventional power, and how to protect U.S. ground and naval forces abroad from WMD attacks. This concern is all well and good, but it abets a drift of attention away from the main danger. The primary risk is not that enemies might lob some nuclear or chemical weapons at U.S. armored battalions or ships, awful as that would be. Rather, it is that they might attempt to punish the United States by triggering American cities.

CHOOSE YOUR WEAPONS WELL

UNTIL the past decade, the issue was nuclear arms, period. Chemical weapons received some attention from specialists, but never made the priority list of presidents and cabinets. Biological weapons were almost forgotten after they were banned by the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention. Chemical and biological arms have received more attention in the 1990's. The issues posed by the trio lumped under the umbrella of mass destruction differ, however. Most significantly, biological weapons have received less attention than the others but probably represent the greatest danger.

Chemical weapons have been noticed more in the past decade, especially since they were used by Iraq against Iranian troops in the 1980-88 Iran-Iraq War and against Kurdish civilians in 1988. Chemicals are far more widely available than nuclear weapons because the technology required to produce them is far simpler, and large numbers of countries have undertaken chemical weapons programs. But chemical weapons are not really in the same class as other weapons of mass destruction, in the sense of ability to inflict a huge number of civilian casualties in a single strike.

For the tens of thousands of fatalities as in, say, the biggest strategic bombing raids of World War II, it would be very difficult logistically and operationally to deliver chemical weapons in necessary quantities over wide areas.

Nevertheless, much attention and effort have been lavished on a campaign to eradicate chemical weapons. This may be a good thing, but the side effects are not entirely benign. For one, banning

chemicals means that for deterrence, nuclear weapons become even more important than they used to be. That is because a treaty cannot assuredly prevent hostile nations from deploying chemical weapons, while the United States has forsworn the option to retaliate in kind.

In the past, the United States had a no-first-use policy for chemical weapons but reserved the right to strike back with them if an enemy used them first. The 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), which entered into force last April, requires the United States to destroy its stockpile, thus ending this option. The United States did the same with biological arms long ago, during the Nixon administration. Eliminating its own chemical and biological weapons practically precludes a no-first-use policy for nuclear weapons, since they become the only WMD available for retaliation.

Would the United States follow through and use nuclear weapons against a country or group that had killed several thousand Americans with deadly chemicals? It is hard to imagine breaking the post-Nagasaki taboo in that situation. But schemes for conventional military retaliation would not suffice without detracting from the force of American deterrent threats. There would be a risk for the United States in setting a precedent that someone could use WMD against Americans without suffering similar destruction in return. Limiting the range of deterrent alternatives available to U.S. strategy will not necessarily cause deterrence to fail, but it will certainly not strengthen it.

The ostensible benefit of the CWC is that it will make chemical arms harder to acquire and every bit as illegal and stigmatized as biological weapons have been for a quarter-century. If it has that benefit, what effect will the ban have on the choices of countries or groups who want some kind of WMD in any case, whether for purposes of deterrence, aggression, or revenge? At the margin, the ban will reduce the disincentives to acquiring biological weapons, since they will be no less illegal, no harder to obtain or conceal, and far more damaging than chemical weapons. If major reductions in the chemical threat produce even minor increases in the biological threat, it will be a bad trade.

One simple fact should worry Americans more about biological than about nuclear or chemical arms: unlike either of the other two, nuclear weapons combine maximum destructiveness and easy use, have great killing capacity but are hard to get; chemical weapons are easy to get but lack such killing capacity; biological agents have both qualities. A 1993 study by the Office of Technology assessment concluded that a single airplane delivering 100 kilograms of anthrax spores -- a dormant phase of a bacillus that multiplies rapidly in the body, producing toxins and rapid hemorrhaging -- by aerosol on a clear, calm night over the Washington, D.C., area could kill between one million and three million people, 300 times as many fatalities as if the plane had delivered sarin gas in amounts ten times larger.

Like chemical weapons but unlike nuclear weapons, biologicals are relatively easy to make. Innovations in biotechnology have obviated many of the old problems in handling and preserving biological agents, and many have been freely available for scientific research. Nuclear weapons are not likely to be the WMD of choice for non-state terrorist groups. They require huge investments and targetable infrastructure, and are subject to credible threats by the United States. An aggrieved group that decides it wants to kill huge numbers of Americans will find the mission easier to accomplish with anthrax than with a nuclear explosion.

Inside the Pentagon, concern about biological weapons has picked up tremendously in the past couple of years, but there is little serious

attention to the problem elsewhere. This could be a good thing if nothing much can be done, since publicity might only give enemies ideas. But it is a bad thing if it impedes efforts to take steps -- such as civil defense -- that could blunt nuclear, chemical, or biological attacks.

DETERRENCE AND ARMS CONTROL IN DECLINE

Deterrence requires knowledge of who has launched an attack.

AN OLD vocabulary still dominates policy discussion Of WMD. Rhetoric in the defense establishment falls back on the all-purpose strategic buzzword of the Cold War: deterrence. But deterrence now covers fewer of the threats the United States faces than it did during the Cold War.

The logic of deterrence is clearest when the issue is preventing unprovoked and unambiguous aggression, when the aggressor recognizes that it is the aggressor rather than the defender. Deterrence is less reliable when both sides in a conflict see each other as the aggressor. When the United States intervenes in messy Third World conflicts, the latter is often true. In such cases, the side that the United States wants to deter may see itself as trying to deter the United States. Such situations are ripe for miscalculation.

For the country that used to be the object of U.S. deterrence Russia -- the strategic burden has been reversed. Based on assumptions of Soviet conventional military superiority, U.S. strategy used to rely on the threat to escalate -- to be the first to use nuclear weapons during a way to deter attack by Soviet armored divisions. Today the tables have turned. There is no Warsaw Pact, Russia has half or less of the military potential of the Soviet Union, and its current conventional forces are in disarray, while NATO is expanding eastward. It is now Moscow that has the incentive to compensate for conventional weakness by placing heavier reliance on nuclear capabilities. The Russians adopted a nuclear no-first-use policy in the early 1980s, but renounced it after their precipitous post-Cold War decline.

Today Russia needs to be reassured, not deterred. The main danger from Russian WMD is leakage from vast stockpiles to anti-American groups elsewhere -- the "loose nukes" problem. So long as the United States has no intention of attacking the Russians, their greater reliance on nuclear forces is not a problem. If the United States has an interest in reducing nuclear stockpiles, however, it is.

The traditional American approach-thinking in terms of its own deterrence strategies -- provides no guidance. Indeed, noises some Americans still make about deterring the Russians compound the problem by reinforcing Moscow's alarm.

Similarly, U.S. conventional military superiority gives China an incentive to consider more reliance on an escalation strategy. The Chinese have a long-standing no-first-use policy but adopted it when their strategic doctrine was that of "People's war," which relied on mass mobilization and low-tech weaponry. Faith in that doctrine was severely shaken by the American performance in the Persian Gulf War. Again, the United States might assume that there is no problem as long as Beijing only wants to deter and the United States does not want to attack. But how do these assumptions relate to the prospect of a war over Taiwan? That is a conflict that no one wants but that can hardly be ruled out in light of evolving tensions. If the United States decides openly to deter Beijing from attacking Taiwan, the

old lore from the Cold War may be relevant. But if Washington continues to leave policy ambiguous, who will know who is deterring whom? Ambiguity is a recipe for confusion and miscalculation in a time of crisis. For all the upsurge of attention in the national security establishment to the prospect of conflict with China, there has been remarkably little discussion of the role of nuclear weapons in a Sino-American collision.

The main problem for deterrence, however, is that it still relies on the corpus of theory that undergirded Cold War policy, dominated by reliance on the threat of second-strike retaliation. But retaliation requires knowledge of who has launched an attack and the address at which they reside. These requirements are not a problem when the threat comes from a government, but they are if the enemy is anonymous. Today some groups may wish to punish the United States without taking credit for the action -- a mass killing equivalent to the 1988 bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland. Moreover, the options the defense establishment favors have shifted over entirely from deterrence to preemption. The majority of those who dealt with nuclear weapons policy during the Cold War adamantly opposed developing first-strike options. Today, scarcely anyone looks to that old logic when thinking about rogues or terrorists, and most hope to be able to mount a disarming action against any group with WMD.

Finally, eliminating chemical weapons trims some options for deterrence. Arms control restrictions on the instruments that can be used for deterrent threats are not necessarily the wrong policy, but they do work against maximizing deterrence. Overall, however, the problem with arms control is not that it does too much but that it now does relatively little.

From the Limited Test Ban negotiations in the 1960s through the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, and Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces negotiations in the 1970s and 1980s, arms control treaties were central to managing WMD threats. Debates about whether particular agreements with Moscow were in the United States' interest were bitter because everyone believed that the results mattered. Today there is no consensus that treaties regulating armaments matter much. Among national security experts, the corps that pays close attention to START and Conventional Forces in Europe negotiations has shrunk. With the exception of the Chemical Weapons Convention, efforts to control WMD by treaty have become small potatoes. The biggest recent news in arms control has not been any negotiation to regulate WMD, but a campaign to ban land mines.

The United States' Cold War partner in arms control, Russia, has disarmed a great deal voluntarily. But despite standard rhetoric, the United States has not placed a high priority on convincing Moscow to divest itself of more of its nuclear weapons; the Clinton administration has chosen to promote NATO expansion, which pushes the Russians in the opposite direction.

The 1968 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty remains a hallowed institution, but it has nowhere new to go. It will not convert the problem countries that want to obtain WMD -- unless, like Iraq and North Korea in the 1980s, they sign and accept the legal obligation and then simply cheat. The NPT regime will continue to impede access to fissile materials on the open market, but it will not do so in novel or more effective ways. And it does not address the problem of Russian "loose nukes" any better than the Russian and American governments do on their own.

Stockpiling gas masks and antibiotics could reduce the death toll.

DESPITE ALL the new limitations, deterrence remains an important aspect of strategy. There is not much the United States needs to do to keep up its deterrence capability, however, given the thousands of nuclear weapons and the conventional military superiority it has. Where capabilities are grossly underdeveloped, however, is the area of responses for coping should deterrence fail.

Enthusiasts for defensive capability, mostly proponents of the Strategic Defense Initiative from the Reagan years, remain fixated on the least relevant form of it: high-tech active defenses to intercept ballistic missiles. There is still scant interest in what should now be the first priority: civil defense preparations to cope with uses of WMD within the United States. Active defenses" against missiles would be expensive investments that might or might not work against a threat the United States probably will not face for years, but would do nothing against the threat it already faces. Civil defense measures are extremely cheap and could prove far more effective than they would have against a large-scale Soviet attack.

During the Cold War, debate about antimissile defense concerned whether it was technologically feasible or cost-effective and whether it would threaten the Soviets and ignite a spiraling arms race between offensive and defensive weapons. One need not refight the battles over SDI to see that the relevance to current WMD threats is tenuous. Iraq, Iran, or North Korea will not be able to deploy intercontinental missiles for years. Nor, if they are strategically cunning, should they want to. For the limited number of nuclear warheads these countries are likely to have, and especially for biological weapons, other means of delivery are more easily available. Alternatives to ballistic missiles include aircraft, ship-launched cruise missiles, and unconventional means, such as smuggling, at which the intelligence agencies of these countries have excelled. Non-state perpetrators like those who bombed the World Trade Center will choose clandestine means of necessity.

A ballistic missile defense system, whether it costs more or less than the \$60 billion the Congressional Budget Office recently estimated would be required for one limited option, will not counter these modes of attack. Indeed, if a larger part of the worry about WMD these days is about their use by terrorist states or groups, the odds are higher that sometime, somewhere in the country, some of these weapons will go off, despite the best efforts to stop them. If that happens, the United States should have in place whatever measures can mitigate the consequences.

By the later phases of the Cold War it was hard to get people interested in civil defense against an all-out Soviet attack that could detonate thousands of high-yield nuclear weapons in U.S. population centers. To many, the lives that would have been saved seemed less salient than the many millions that would still have been lost. It should be easier to see the value of civil defense, however, in the context of more limited attacks, perhaps with only a few low-yield weapons. A host of minor measures can increase protection or recovery from biological, nuclear, or chemical effects. Examples are stockpiling or distribution of protective masks; equipment and training for decontamination; standby Programs for mass vaccinations and emergency treatment with antibiotics; wider and deeper planning of emergency response procedures; and public education about hasty sheltering and emergency actions to reduce individual vulnerability.

Such programs would not make absorbing a WMD attack tolerable. But inadequacy is no excuse for neglecting actions that could reduce death and suffering, even if the difference in casualties is small. Civil defenses are especially worthwhile considering that they are extraordinarily cheap compared with regular military programs or active defense systems. Yet until recently, only half a billion dollars -- less than two tenths of one percent of the defense budget and less than \$2 a head for every American -- went to chemical and biological defense, while nearly \$4 billion was spent annually on ballistic missile defense. Why haven't policymakers attended to first things first-cheap programs that can cushion the effects of a disaster-before undertaking expensive programs that, provide no assurance they will be able to prevent it?

One problem is conceptual inertia. The Cold War accustomed strategists to worrying about an enemy with thousands of WMD, rather than foes with a handful. For decades the question of strategic defense was also posed as a debate between those who saw no alternative to relying on deterrence and those who hoped that an astrodome over the United States could replace deterrence with invulnerability. None of these hoary fixations address the most probable WMD threats in the post-Cold War world.

Opposition to Cold War civil defense programs underlies psychological aversion to them now. Opponents used to argue that civil defense was a dangerous illusion because it could do nothing significant to reduce the horror of an attack that would obliterate hundreds of cities, because it would promote a false sense of security, and because it could even be destabilizing and provoke attack in a crisis. Whether or not such arguments were valid then, they are not now. But both then and now, there has been a powerful reason that civil defense efforts have been unpopular: they alarm people. They remind them that their vulnerability to mass destruction is not a bad dream, not something that strategic schemes for deterrence, preemption, or interception are sure to solve.

Civil defense can limit damage but not minimize it. For example, some opponents may be able to develop biological agents that circumvent available vaccines and antibiotics. (Those with marginal technical capabilities, however, might be stopped by blocking the easier options). Which is worse-the limitations of defenses, or having to answer for failure to try. The moment that WMD are used somewhere in a manner that produces tens of thousands of fatalities, there will be hysterical outbursts of all sorts. One of them will surely be, "Why didn't the government prepare us for this?" It is not in the long-term interest of political leaders to indulge popular aversion. If public resistance under current circumstances prevents widespread distribution, stockpiling, and instruction in the use of defensive equipment or medical services, the least that should be done is to optimize plans and preparations to rapidly implement such activities when the first crisis ignites demand.

As threats of terrorism using WMD are taken more seriously, interest will grow in preemptive defense measures -- the most obvious of which is intensified intelligence collection. Where this involves targeting groups within the United States that might seem to be potential breeding grounds for terrorist acts, (for example, supporters of Palestinian militants, home-grown militias or cults, or radicals with ties to Iran, Iraq, or Libya), controversies will arise over constitutional limits on invasion of privacy or search and seizure. So long as the WMD danger remains hypothetical, such controversies will not be easily resolved. They have not come to the fore so far because U.S. law enforcement has been unbelievably lucky in apprehending terrorists. The group arrested in 1993 for planning to

bomb the Lincoln Tunnel happened to be infiltrated by an informer, and Timothy McVeigh happened to be picked up in 1995 for driving without a license plate. Those who fear compromising civil liberties with permissive standards for government snooping should consider what is likely to happen once such luck runs out and it proves impossible to identify perpetrators. Suppose a secretive radical Islamic group launches a biological attack, kills 100,000 people, and announces that it will do the same thing again if its terms are not met. (The probability of such a scenario may not be high, but it can no longer be consigned to science fiction.) In that case, it is hardly unthinkable that a panicked legal system would roll over and treat Arab-Americans as it did the Japanese-Americans who were herded into concentration camps after Pearl Harbor. Stretching limits domestic surveillance to reduce the chances of facing such choices could be the lesser evil.

IS RETREAT THE BEST DEFENSE?

No PROGRAM s aimed at controlling adversaries' capabilities can eliminate the dangers. One risk is that in the more fluid politics of the post-Cold War world, the United States could stumble into an unanticipated crisis with Russia or China. There are no well-established rules of the game to brake a spiraling conflict over the Baltic states or Taiwan, as there were in the superpower competition after the Cuban missile crisis. The second danger is that some angry group that blames the United States for its problems may decide to coerce Americans, or simply exact vengeance by inflicting devastation on them where they live.

If steps to deal with the problem in terms of capabilities are limited, can anything be done to address intentions -- the incentives of any foreign power or group to lash out at the United States? There are few answers to this question that do not compromise the fundamental strategic activism and internationalist thrust of U.S. foreign policy over the past half-century. That is because the best way to keep people from believing that the United States is responsible for their problems is to avoid involvement in their conflicts.

Ever since the Munich agreement and Pearl Harbor, with only a brief interruption during the decade after the Tet offensive, there has been a consensus that if Americans did not draw their defense perimeter far forward and confront foreign troubles in their early stages, those troubles would come to them at home. But because the United States is now the only superpower and weapons of mass destruction have become more accessible, American intervention in troubled areas is not so much a way to fend off such threats as it is what stirs them up.

Will U.S. involvement in unstable situations around the former U.S.S.R. head off conflict with Moscow or generate it? Will making NATO bigger and moving it to Russia's doorstep deter Russian pressure on Ukraine and the Baltics or provoke it? With Russia and China, there is less chance that either will set out to conquer Europe or Asia than that they will try to restore old sovereignties and security zones by reincorporating new states of the former Soviet Union or the province of Taiwan. None of this means that NATO expansion or support for Taiwan's autonomy will cause nuclear war. It does mean that to whatever extent American activism increases those countries' incentives to rely on WMD while intensifying political friction between them and Washington, it is counterproductive.

The other main danger is the ire of smaller states or religious and cultural groups that see the United States as an evil force blocking their legitimate aspirations. It is hardly likely that Middle

Eastern radicals would be hatching schemes like the destruction of the World Trade Center if the United States had not been identified for so long as the mainstay of Israel, the shah of Iran, and conservative Arab regimes and the source of a cultural assault on Islam. Cold War triumph magnified the problem. U.S. military and cultural hegemony -- the basic threats to radicals seeking to challenge the status quo--are directly linked to the imputation of American responsibility for maintaining world order. Playing Globocop feeds the urge of aggrieved groups to strike back.

Is this a brief for isolationism? No. It is too late to turn off foreign resentments by retreating, even if that were an acceptable course. Alienated groups and governments would not stop blaming Washington for their problems. In addition, there is more to foreign policy than dampening incentives to hurt the United States. It is not automatically sensible to stop pursuing other interests for the sake of uncertain reductions in a threat of uncertain probability. Security is not an of a piece, and survival is only part of security.

But it is no longer prudent to assume that important security interests complement each other as they did during the Cold War. The interest at the very core -- protecting the American homeland from attack -- may now often be in conflict with security more broadly conceived and with the interests that mandate promoting American political values, economic interdependence, social Westernization, and stability in regions beyond Western Europe and the Americas. The United States should not give up all its broader political interests, but it should tread cautiously in areas -- especially the Middle East where broader interests grate against the core imperative of preventing mass destruction within America's borders.

RICHARD K. BETTS is Director of National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations and Professor of Political Science and Director of the Institute for War and Peace Studies at Columbia University.

.



.

Let Them Live In Fear

Delivered-To: biowar-1@afterburner.sonic.net

To: "BIOWAR-List"

Subject: [BIOWAR] Denial keeps us from being paralyzed by fear

Date: Sat, 28 Feb 1998 16:35:44 -0500

From <http://www.jacksonvilledailynews.com/stories/022898/55122.shtml>

Denial keeps us from being paralyzed by fear

It was, as I recall, on the last Friday of the month that the air raid sirens would sound. It was a high-pitched wail, rising and falling and seeming to come from everywhere at once. That was our signal to stop our schoolwork and kneel beneath our desks, heads down, hands clasped behind our necks.

This was called a drop drill. Evidently someone in authority was of the opinion that cowering beneath an inch of wood and shielding your head was enough to save you from the effects of a thermonuclear exchange. Your tax dollars at work.

I didn't think about it much when I was a child. It was just another piece of the school-day routine, like fire drills and pop quizzes. Wasn't until I got older that I began to reflect on the horror my elders had feared and the laughable inadequacy of their response.

Of course, what response would be equal to the threat of millions of people dead by nuclear fire?

When I reached an age to understand these things, there was born in me a fear so large I had to consign it to the furthest fringes of my mind, shrink it till it was just a ghost troubling the occasional sleepless dawn. Nuclear exchange was a thought too awful for thinking, filled me with too palpable a sense of my own soft vulnerability.

Not unlike a threat of anthrax.

Does it reassure you that authorities have dropped federal charges against microbiologist and alleged white supremacist Larry Harris, that they've determined it wasn't anthrax he was caught with last week, but a harmless anthrax-based vaccine? Me, I'm not reassured at all. The threat alone was too chilling a reminder of how dangerous is the world, how easily we can die.

Anthrax is a deadly agent that kills in microscopic doses. Persons it afflicts initially suffer flu-like symptoms. A few days later, they die. I've heard little expert consensus on the probable death toll if, say, a vial of the stuff were released in a crowded subway or sprayed from a low-flying plane. Suffice it to say that their most conservative estimate says the dead would number in the tens of thousands.

So I find myself doing something I haven't done since the Cold War days when every week seemed to bring a new reminder of nuclear Armageddon. Namely, living in denial. Whispering my mantra of sweet reassurance. Telling myself that the unthinkable can't happen because, after all, there are safeguards in place and crackerjack people on the lookout.

Don't tell me I'm fooling myself. I already know this. Heck, that's the whole point. That's the only thing that gets me through the day.

I suspect I'm not alone in this, not the only one who shudders at the threat and then changes the subject -- as if ignoring it might make it go away. Amazing that this impulse still survives. Even after the World Trade Center. Even after Oklahoma City. Even now.

Some would-be terrorist gets caught before carrying out some scheme of mass destruction and we go on just as before, returning to normal concerns as if it were somehow divinely preordained that everything will turn out OK. We are emotionally malleable, spiritually adaptable, believe what we must to keep moving forward. We never face the niggling little what-ifs that could stop us cold.

And yet ...

What if, one day, it doesn't work out OK? What if one day, it's never OK again? What then?

I suppose the bureaucrats who had us kneeling under desks in anticipation of a nuclear exchange were only doing what comes naturally in the face of the unthinkable. Exercising the illusion of control. Pretending to have it covered. Trying to contain a fear that seeps

under consciousness like a slow-moving spill.

What else are you going to do? We only have the two choices.

We live in denial.

Or else, we live in fear. KNIGHT RIDDER

Leonard Pitts is a columnist for the Miami Herald.

BIOWAR-L Biowar/Bioterrorism/Toxins Mailing List

To unsubscribe or subscribe: send a message to majordomo@sonic.net

with the following text: unsubscribe BIOWAR-L or subscribe BIOWAR-L.

Post to: (BIOWAR-L@mail.sonic.net). Archive:

(<http://www.sonic.net/~west/digest.htm>). BIOWAR Web site:

(<http://www.sonic.net/~west/biowar.htm>). [Wes Thomas \(west@sonic.net\)](mailto:west@sonic.net)

.



.

We Educated Our Enemies to Destroy Us

.

FRONT PAGE STORY

From the

HERALD SUN SUNDAY - Melbourne, Australia

February 15, 1998

**SADDAM'S SINISTER SCIENTIST:
THE DEADLIEST WOMAN IN THE WORLD!**

***** DR. RIHAB TAHA *****

***** DR. RIHAB TAHA *****

***** DR. RIHAB TAHA *****

--- Special Report by Ron Laytner ---

SHE is the mother of a baby daughter, but makes unspeakable potions to kill people by the tens of thousands. She is the mousy British-trained scientist who is now Saddam Hussein's heroine in the chemical weapons laboratories of Iraq.

Meet the woman they call Dr. Germ --- mastermind of the Doomsday arsenal that contains enough chemicals and viruses to kill everyone on Earth twice over.

Dr. Rihab Taha, 42, has overseen the creation of 10 billion doses of the bugs responsible for anthrax, botulism, ebola, and bubonic plague.

If her deadly weapons were released on battlefields or against the world's major cities, she could go down in history as the world's deadliest woman.

Meanwhile, Pentagon chief General Henry Shelton revealed a plan to blast Iraq with cruise missiles and bombs.

SHE has been dubbed Dr. Germ --- the most dangerous woman to walk the Earth, and already this British-trained scientist has created enough biological weapons to kill everyone on EARTH twice over.

Yet, in Saddam Hussein's Iraq, she is a heroine, who, only two weeks ago, was publicly applauded by the dictator at Baghdad's Military Industrial Commission as he handed her a glittering prize for her deadly work.

In a neat, blue suit and sober jewellery, Dr. Rihab Taha, 42 and at the centre of the growing Iraqi crisis, smiled her thanks before driving home to look after her baby daughter in a smart and very secure Baghdad townhouse.

For this mother, with mousy hair now flecked with grey, is the person who persuaded Saddam Hussein to launch his controversial germ warfare program back in the 1980s.

And it is her lethal handiwork, started on her return from the University of East Anglia, in the cathedral town of Norwich, England, in 1984, and kept secret by Saddam Hussein, that has sparked the latest crisis.

In an extraordinary decade, Dr. Germ has overseen the creation of 10 billion killer doses of toxins, including botulinum, a vicious food poisoning bug that provokes a swollen tongue, frothing mouth and dizziness before a victim's rapid death. She is suspected of producing a host of lethal viruses and bacteria that are stockpiled secretly in Iraq in bunkers and factories known only to Saddam's henchmen.

Most incredibly, she has masterminded the testing of anthrax, which dissolves the kidneys, liver, and lungs leading to death within two days, on rats, mice, dogs, sheep, and donkeys. Almost certainly, humans too, say United Nations inspectors.

Videos seized by them two years ago showed the animals, often placed in sealed plastic boxes, writhing in agony as the biological agents took their toll.

Today it seems certain that under Dr. Germ's direction, research also was done into haemorrhagic conjunctivitis, which temporarily blinds

and makes eyes bleed, plus another ghastly virus leading to lethal diarrhoea in children. Dr. Germ became an expert on camel pox, which provokes bleeding skin lesions, and a rare African fever.

As the scale of Dr. Germ's foul deeds come to light, those who knew her in Norwich --- where for five years she studied plant toxins and would return from holidays in Iraq with gift-wrapped boxes of dates for fellow students --- have expressed surprise at the notorious rise of a "very ordinary" scientist and nondescript girl, who loved watching the BBC in her spare time.

"She talked about Saddam Hussein as though he was someone she admired, almost on fatherly terms," admitted a student who befriended Dr. Germ at the time.

"But she was difficult to get to know. She and two other Iraqi girls would keep up to date on the Iran-Iraqi conflict by staying glued to the TV."

Today her professors speculate that Dr. Rihab Taha may have been sent to the West specifically to gain expert knowledge on biological weaponry for the regime back home. Or, they wonder, did her skills just fit neatly into an emerging master plan when she returned to her native Iraq?

"It's like your daughter has gone and done something dreadful. Finding out what Taha does now has been a great shock to me," says Dr. John Turner, the head of the East Anglia University's biology department and her teacher for four years.

"Of all the students I have had, Taha is the last person I would suspect of doing something like this. She kept quiet and was in the background. Although she was well liked, she was not a gifted student, but very hard-working. I am flabbergasted."

Even the first UN inspector to meet Dr. Germ, though aware that she played a key role, was unprepared for the woman he faced; a woman so nervous that she even shyly sought his opinion of her work as a scientist.

"She was an unassuming individual to look at her. No one would suspect that she was the head of the country's germ warfare program," admits Dr. David Huxsoll, who headed the initial UN weapon inspection team in 1991. (He was the former commander of the U.S. Army's Medical Institute of Infectious Diseases at Fort Detrick Maryland. After heading the UN inspection team in 1991, he returned in 1994. He is now dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine at Louisiana State University.)

UN inspectors have, at last, discovered the truth about the sinister work of Dr. Germ --- and other Iraqi scientists, many of whom were educated at British universities --- despite her own desperate attempts at a cover up.

After seven years of sleuthing, they believe Dr. Germ's Doomsday arsenal of biological weaponry may have been used on human guinea pigs.

Recent Israeli intelligence reports point to such atrocities at Salman Park, a military complex 80km south of Baghdad.

According to Israeli military sources, it was here --- from safely behind a glass screen --- that Iraqi scientists watched as Iranian prisoners of war were strapped to beds in an underground room. On the ceiling was a powerful spraygun aimed at the terrified men

beneath.

On occasions, the spraygun poured out anthrax bacteria which penetrates the skin and lungs, leaving the prisoners dying in agony from internal haemorrhaging. At other times, it contained toxins for use in chemical weapons. Again, the victims faced a horrible death.

In another test, at an open-air site near Iraq's border with Saudi Arabi, 12 Iranian prisoners were tied to posts while shells loaded with anthrax were blown up by remote control a few metres away. The heads of the doomed dozen were shielded to protect them from shrapnel so the power of the bacteria could be properly monitored. Each died from the disease a couple of days later.

It is the horrific possibility of experimentation on humans that is now being explored by the UN inspectors, who were turned away from the Abu Gharib jail, near Baghdad, when they tried to uncover evidence that prisoners had been removed for the obscene testing two years ago.

Raymond Zilimskas, a former germ warfare analyst at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the US, met Dr. Germ and her sidekicks on two trips to Iraq. He says her scientific and management prowess was obvious to him. But, today, he wonders if Saddam Hussein is trying to hide the extent of this monster woman's work exactly because it involved experiments on humans.

"That's what everybody's asking," Zilimskas said recently. "The speculation is that in Iraq there probably has to be unsavory activities, including unethical experimentation. The real mystery has to do with testing. It is the records of this work that Iraq will go to any lengths to hide."

So, despite their undoubted skills, the inspectors -- men and women from 21 countries -- have a hard job. As they search in river beds and tunnels for warheads fitted with deadly germs, in ministries for an odd file that might give them a clue, they concede that they are up against a determined madman in Saddam Hussein.

But they are secretly helped by Israel, which has a national interest in preventing Iraq keeping or acquiring weapons of mass destruction. In 1981, Israeli war planes bombed Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactors to prevent the country building a nuclear bomb. During the Gulf War, Iraq, in response, aimed Scud missiles at Israel and its extraordinary 50 metre-long "supergun," a one-shot weapon designed to fire chemical or biological payloads, was aimed directly at Tel Aviv.

Today, Israeli agents pass information under cover to the UN, which is wary of publicity about the arrangement because of the Arab world's animosity to the Jewish state. Israeli agents never enter the UN, but meetings are set up in safe houses and hotel rooms so vital intelligence can be passed over the help of Saddam Hussein's war machine.

And, in Israel, thousands of citizens line up for biological gas masks, knowing that an attack on Iraq will bring Iraqi bio-missiles to Jerusalem and Tel Aviv.

Since the inspection regime was set up by the UN only weeks after Iraq's defeat in the Gulf War in 1991, a fantastic array of Saddam Hussein's instruments of mass destruction has been destroyed or removed, including an assembled supergun, 150 Scud missiles, 30 chemical warheads and 690 tons of chemical weapons. In fact, more Iraqi weaponry has been disarmed in this way that the US and its

Allies managed to eliminate by bombing in the 1991 conflict.

Yet, despite successes, the UN believes many of the most dangerous weapons of all --- the biological ones --- are hidden by the Iraqis. At one stage, inspectors feared that sizeable quantities of anthrax were being driven around the country in refrigerated trucks by Saddam Hussein's Special Republican Guard so it could not be found.

Certainly, when Dr. Germ was first relentlessly questioned about her research she denied everything, bursting into tears, throwing tantrums, and even storming out of the interview room.

A deliberate liar, she pretended that all biological agents and munitions had been destroyed in the months after the Gulf War. Dr. Taha also kept secret the existence of a germ warfare factory at al_hakim, 130km west of Baghdad, where lethal research was carried out under her instructions.

At the heart of Iraq's biological warfare effort, code-named Project 324 because work started at al_hakam on March 24, 1988, the factory produced gas gangrene, which makes the skin of a human melt and fall off. It was from there, during the Gulf War, that Dr. Germ carried out Saddam Hussein's personal instructions to experiment on loading bombs and missile warheads with deadly toxins.

At the secret factory -- which escaped US and British aerial bombardment during Gulf War action, but has been since destroyed by the UN -- the tiny, but determined female scientist discovered that a single missile warhead filled with anthrax could annihilate 30,000 or 40,000 people in 12 hours of hell. A teacup of the toxin is enough to wipe out the inhabitants of a small town.

Yet, when Dr. Germ was grilled about the al-Hakam factory, she insisted it was making only chicken feed to help end the hunger of Iraq's people. "Our country now needs fat chickens and lots of eggs, so we are trying to do just that," she claimed. "This project is purely for civilian use."

That was, of course, a lie. But her devious work, including a plan to wreak havoc in the West by developing an antibiotic-resistant chemical, earned Dr. Taha friends in high places. On one notable occasion, as a UN inspector began to list the biological agents she had developed, he reported she started to cry hysterically.

Suddenly, General Amer Kashid, Iraqi official in charge of liaising with the UN inspections team --- and a mastermind of the attacks on Kuwait, Israel, and Saudi Arabia during the Gulf conflict --- stepped in. He called the inspector a bad scientist for accusing Dr. Germ of misdeeds.

Soon after, the inspectors discovered the general was in love with Dr. Taha and had sired her daughter. He had quietly married her in 1994, despite still being married to another woman, the mother of his six-year-old child.

However, the real breakthrough came when Saddam Hussein's son-in-law, General Hussein Kamal -- himself a super weapons expert -- defected from Iraq to Jordan in 1995 and told the world about Dr. Germ. He said her charming ways and pleasant manner were nothing but a sham.

General Kamal's testimony about Taha and Iraq's bio-weapons preparations came to an end when he was personally convinced by Saddam Hussein to return to Iraq, where he was immediately killed.

But he gave the first open knowledge of Saddam's monstrous woman

scientist who had worked on killer viruses and forms of germ warfare --- a woman who was completely unknown before. This was the woman who had a child at home, but was preparing potions to kill other mothers' babies.

Faced with the damning new evidence, Dr. Taha confessed. "She suddenly had no hesitation about presenting herself as the brains behind the biological weapon-building in Iraq," one UN weapons inspector commented.

"She is proud of her country and proud of her work. I don't think she had a qualm in the world about her misdeeds."

Today, Dr. Rihab Taha must be high on the target list of the West's secret services. Perhaps higher, even, than Saddam Hussein. She also may be a war criminal for violating the international laws on germ warfare.

But in Iraq she is upheld as a shining example of womanhood by Saddam Hussein, who gave her the prize for scientific achievement so very recently.

"It was obviously for her work in biological weaponry," a UN scientist observed the other day. "Dr. Germ has never achieved anything else during the whole of her career to date. But she may go down in history as the most deadly woman of all time."

.

See also:

- [*The World's Deadliest Woman? Dr. Germ Heads Saddam's Biological Warfare Program*](#) -- MSNBC News
- [*American Colleges Are Weapons U For Iraq*](#) -- U.S. News & World Report -- 030998

.



.

Origins of Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction

.

Subject: [BIOWAR] US helped Iraq develop bio, chemical arms-report
Sender: owner-biowar-1@afterburner.sonic.net

Fowarded as received..

=

06:22 PM ET 02/12/98

US helped Iraq develop bio, chemical arms-report

LONDON (Reuters) - The United States helped Iraq develop its chemical and biological weapons programs in the 1980s while Britain sold Baghdad the antidote to nerve gas as late as March 1992, Britain's Channel Four television news said Thursday.

The program said it had found U.S. intelligence documents which showed 14 consignments of biological materials were exported from the United States to Iraq between 1985 and 1989.

These included 19 batches of anthrax bacteria and 15 batches of botulinum, the organism that causes botulism. The exports, backed by the State Department, were licensed by the Department of Commerce, it said.

The program said Iraq had bought other toxins from the United States while the atomic energy commission in Baghdad acquired human genetic material and E. coli bacteria for use as a culture medium.

No less than 29 batches of material were sent after Iraq had used gas in an attack on the Kurdish town of Halabja in 1988, killing 5,000 people, it said.

Stephen Bryen, a former senior Pentagon official in the 1980s, said he and a few colleagues had tried hard to stop the exports of sensitive materials.

`They just were stupid, utterly stupid, and the people who did it I don't think had even a slight grasp of what they were doing,' he told Channel Four.

He said he had managed to stop a 1988 order from Iraq for 1.5 million doses of atropine, which is used to protect troops from nerve gas.

Channel Four news quoted from a classified U.S. Department of Defense document which it said showed Iraq had bought pralidoxine -- an antidote to nerve gas -- from Britain in March 1992, after the Gulf War.

``This (sale) took place, as I understand it, long before we came into government,' British Defense Secretary George Robertson told the program.

``We'll investigate it, but I understand it probably was exported on the grounds that it was medication and medications are allowable exports to Iraq today."

Channel Four also said it had uncovered U.S. intelligence documents which showed London and Washington knew as long ago as August 1990 of the existence of Agent 15, a deadly nerve gas. Robertson, releasing what he said was new information about Iraq's 1991 weapon stocks, on Monday said Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein may have possessed large quantities of Agent 15.

`There may well have been some knowledge of the range of things Saddam might have had at that time but the concrete information has only gradually come forward (in) recent times,' Robertson told Channel Four.

REUTERS

BIOWAR-L Biowar/Bioterrorism/Toxins Mailing List

To unsubscribe or subscribe: send a message to majordomo@sonic.net
with the following text: unsubscribe BIOWAR-L or subscribe BIOWAR-L.

Post to: (BIOWAR-L@mail.sonic.net). Archive:

(http://www.sonic.net/~west/digest.htm). BIOWAR Web site:

(http://www.sonic.net/~west/biowar.htm). -Wes Thomas (west@sonic.net)

.



.

Fight One Dog, You Gotta Fight 'Em All

.

[From U.S. News of Feb. 23, 1998, _](#)

<http://www.usnews.com/usnews/news/iraqwfa.htm>

WEB EXCLUSIVE - Moving Target

Iraq has secretly built chemical weapons plants in Sudan, transferred nuclear materials to Algeria, and sent a dozen of its top scientists to develop a biological warfare complex in Libya.

BY ALAN COOPERMAN

U.S. airstrikes cannot eliminate Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction for the simple reason that Iraq has smuggled many of them to other Arab countries for safekeeping.

That is the conclusion of a draft report by the U.S. House of Representatives Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare which was obtained by U.S. News & World Report magazine.

The report -- based on American, German, and Israeli intelligence -- says that Iraq has secretly built chemical weapons plants in Sudan, transferred nuclear materials to Algeria, and sent a dozen of its top scientists to develop a biological warfare complex in Libya.

The Clinton administration has dispatched three aircraft carriers to

the Persian Gulf and is now building international support for a military strike to punish Saddam Hussein for defying United Nations weapons inspectors.

But "no bombing campaign against Iraq, and even an occupation of that country for that matter, is capable of destroying the hard core of Saddam Hussein's primary WMD [weapons of mass destruction] development and production programs," the congressional report states. "The reason is that under current conditions these programs are run outside of Iraq -- mainly in Sudan and Libya, as well as Algeria (storage of some hot nuclear stuff)."

The transfer of Iraq's nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons technology began even before the Gulf War. As Saddam Hussein realized that the coalition led by the United States was going to bomb his country in 1991, he hastily smuggled know-how, equipment, and key materials to his close allies. And the smuggling has continued right up to the present.

In March/April 1991, Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz got permission from Sudan's president, Umar al-Bashir, to move about 400 Scud missiles and chemical weapons to Sudan for "safekeeping." At the same time, Iraq smuggled nuclear materials, documents, and weapons parts -- including 27.5 pounds of highly-enriched uranium-235 -- to Sudan via Jordan using diplomatic mail privileges. For example, barrels of uranium were hidden in a truck marked "furniture" that went from the Sudanese Embassy in Iraq to Khartoum, the capital of Sudan, in January 1992.

Since Sudan has no nuclear facilities, most of the nuclear materials were later shipped to a Chinese-built research reactor in the Algerian town of Ain Oussera, where they are still being stored, according to the report.

In 1995, Iraq and Sudan jointly built a plant to produce choking mustard gas near Wau in southwestern Sudan. The chemical weapons plant is located in a former fruit factory staffed by Iraqi technicians. The gas has been used at least twice by the Sudanese government against the rebel Sudanese People's Liberation Army in southern Sudan.

In May 1996, the Iraqis and Sudanese tested chemical agents in the desert, and residents got sick when winds shifted suddenly and carried residues into the city of Omdurman.

Last year, Sudan and Iraq completed a far more sophisticated chemical weapons plant along the Blue Nile in the Kafuri region north of Khartoum. The plant is believed to have begun test runs of nerve agents and is producing 122mm and 152mm artillery shells as well as rocket and tactical missile warheads. Iraqi intelligence agents recruited experts from Egypt, Croatia, Bulgaria, and Russia to help with the plant according to the report.

The Iraqis also built a chemical weapons plant at the Yarmook Industrial Complex in the Mayu area south of Khartoum using German-made machines acquired by Iraqi intelligence and smuggled via Bulgaria. Computers were purchased in France. The site includes a mosque, medical clinic, and guest houses for foreign experts from Iraq and Iran. It even has a special farm to keep the "guests" well fed on fresh milk, vegetables, and dates.

In 1995, the congressional report says, Iraq signed a secret agreement to provide Libyan leader Muammar Qadhafi with experts on ballistic missiles. Iraq also sent nuclear fuel and specialists to work on nuclear weapons development at a secret site in Sidi Abu Zurayq, in the desert about 240 miles southwest of Tripoli.

Since the mid-1990s, Iraqi agents have been buying sensitive technology in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, then diverting it to Libya. Late last year, Iraq sent some of its top experts in chemical weapons to the Libyan chemical weapons facility inside a mountain at Tarhunah, 40 miles southeast of Tripoli.

About a dozen Iraqi scientists involved in biological weapons research arrived in Libya at the beginning of this year. They are helping the Libyans develop a new biological warfare complex under the guise of a medical facility called General Health Laboratories. This secret program, codenamed Ibn Hayan, is aimed at producing bombs and missile warheads filled with deadly anthrax and botulism agents, according to the report.

.



.

Of Course, Patriots are Highly Suspicious

.

Subject: More Proof of U.S. gov False Arrests & Propaganda in Anthrax "Plot"

["Michael Johnson" \(USCMike1@aol.com\)](mailto:USCMike1@aol.com) wrote:

Dear Patriots:

Here is additional proof that our benevolent federal government is full of liars, plotters, schemers, and conspirators and they are trying to scare the public into giving up more U.S. Constitutionally guaranteed freedoms and rights. In fact, they are planning on preparing the public to accept the FALSE fact that there are U.S. citizen terrorists trying to kill innocent people.

But, the fact is that it is our own U.S. Government that is going to perpetrate biological warfare against us citizens (the ones who voted our federal leaders into office) and then try to blame good, honest, moral citizens for the crimes that our gov commits against us, just like they did in the Oklahoma City Murrah Federal Building blast. Documented evidence shows that the federal government planted hard wired bombs around numerous pilings inside the building and set off the explosion from the inside and tried to blame it on agricultural fertilizer in a Ryder truck parked outside on the street. They set up Timothy McVeigh really good as a patsy just the way they did Oswald in the federal government perpetrated Kennedy assassination.

Please read in the following Associated Press newsrelease that even with all the hype about domestic terrorists that the government has refused to inform the public or even train them against such an

attack that is because the federal government does not want the public protected against any attack that the federal government wants to perpetrate against us. If you are interested in how to protect yourself from a possible biological warfare attack upon yourself and your family, please feel free to contact me as that is one of the areas in my medical and health fields.

I currently operate the USC Disaster and Emergency Rescue Team training program and biological warfare is definitely a possibility whether perpetrated by foreign terrorists or by our own government.

["Michael Johnson" \(USCMike1@aol.com\)](mailto:USCMike1@aol.com).

.



.

By MICHAEL J. SNIFFEN
The Associated Press

WASHINGTON (Feb. 21) - U.S. Army tests have concluded that the substance seized by agents in Las Vegas was a nonlethal form of anthrax used in vaccines, a federal official said today.

FBI agents discovered the materials Wednesday in Las Vegas when they descended on a beige Mercedes and its two occupants. The men were arrested and jailed in Las Vegas, and the substance was sent for testing to an Army laboratory at Fort Dietrick, Md.

The Army found that the material "is not capable of producing the toxins that normal anthrax would produce," said this federal official, who requested anonymity.

However, the FBI seized other material in Ohio from houses owned by Larry Wayne Harris, a bearded former Aryan Nation member arrested in Las Vegas. That material is still being tested at Fort Dietrick, and those tests will not be completed before Monday.

Although the initial incident sent a shudder of fear through America, the first government tests have confirmed claims made Friday by lawyers for two men arrested in Las Vegas that they were dealing with vaccine material instead of weapons as the FBI alleged.

"The Army has concluded testing of the stuff from the initial arrests, and it is a nonlethal form of anthrax used in vaccines," the federal official said.

The FBI and other federal officials were planning to disclose the results of the first tests at a news conference in Las Vegas later today.

In Las Vegas, Lamond Mills, defense attorney for William Leavitt, the second suspect, said he had not been informed by the FBI or the U.S. attorney's office about the test results. He called the news reports "really good news."

"Legally, this means their case goes down the toilet," said Mills. "I would expect the U.S. attorney to drop the charges."

Mills said he would try to get his client out of jail as early as Saturday.

An attorney for Harris and the U.S. attorney's office weren't immediately available for comment.

Harris and Leavitt were turned in by Ronald Rockwell in Las Vegas, whom the FBI portrayed as a "citizen performing his civic duty."

For his part, Rockwell said he was just plain scared when Leavitt and Harris, who were interested in what he called a "germ-killing" machine, said they had the deadly bacteria.

It's unclear exactly what Leavitt and Harris, both microbiologists, were carrying as they headed to test Rockwell's machine, but Rockwell's claims that the men were carrying deadly anthrax sent federal agents to the Las Vegas area.

Leavitt and Harris were arrested Wednesday night in the suburb of Henderson and charged with conspiracy to possess and possession of a biological agent. They are being held without bond.

The FBI was awaiting tests to determine whether the men had anthrax vaccine or military-grade anthrax, which is potent enough to kill thousands of people.

Rockwell told the Las Vegas Sun, <http://www.lasvegassun.com/> in a story made available on the newspaper's Web site, that he became suspicious after Harris, 46, and Leavitt, 47, changed their stories about plans for his purported germ-killing machine. Rockwell felt that more common bacteria should be used for testing the machine and became nervous when they told him they had anthrax, he said.

"They just said they had military-grade anthrax," Rockwell told the Sun.

Rockwell told a similar story of his conversations with Leavitt and Harris on the "NBC Nightly News" on Friday.

"They lied on what they were going to do," Rockwell said. "It scared me so bad."

Leavitt's lawyer, Lamond Mills - a former U.S. Attorney - said his client didn't think the material was military-grade anthrax but rather anthrax vaccine, which is legal to possess. Leavitt was initially shocked that he was caught up in the investigation, Mills said.

"Today he's not in shock, he's mad. He's just plain mad. We're in a fighting mode now," Mills said.

Leavitt was only interested in Rockwell's machine, which Rockwell tried to sell to the men for \$2 million, Mills said. "When he couldn't scam them, he went the other way," Mills said of Rockwell. "He became a good guy for the FBI."

Harris' attorney, Michael Kennedy, said Rockwell's credibility "is something we're going to look into."

Rockwell, who the FBI said was a cancer research scientist, was convicted of felony extortion in 1981 and 1982. But the FBI has vouched for his credibility, saying the "citizen performing his civic duty" came forward on his own.

In an interview with KVBC-TV, Rockwell said he didn't think the men wanted to infect the Las Vegas area. "Bill Leavitt doesn't want to spread nothing around," he said.

The machine Rockwell was peddling was called the AZ-58 Ray Tube Frequency Instrument Prototype. In glossy brochures, Rockwell says the AZ-58 is able to flush the body clean of bacteria and viruses.

Leavitt wanted to test it before making a \$100,000 down payment and arranged to fly Harris to Las Vegas about a week ago, said Kirby Wells, a lawyer for Leavitt.

It was unclear how Leavitt, a Mormon bishop with strong political ties, got hooked up with Harris, an alleged white supremacist who has been plugging his self-published book about germ warfare.

The FBI has said Harris met Rockwell last summer at a Denver science conference, while Leavitt's attorneys said they believed Rockwell got the men together.

Leavitt is married with three children and has a fire-protection business. The FBI says he also owns microbiology labs in his hometown of Logandale, Nev., and Frankfurt, Germany.

Harris, who is married, claimed to be a lieutenant colonel in the Idaho-based white supremacist group Aryan Nations, the FBI affidavit said.

AP-NY-02-21-98 1448EST

.



.

Just Suppose

[Bradford Metcalf](#)

Just suppose our fearless Kommander in Chief decides to attack Iraq. Do you think Saddam will not follow through on his threat to unleash biologicals in the U.S.? We've all heard the rumor that he has planted his (50) teams of 10 men and 1 woman throughout the U.S. just waiting for some moron like Teflon Willie to do something stupid. Saddam may be crazy but it is obvious that he isn't stupid. He would be a fool NOT to have an insurance policy.

Just suppose the government had figured out that this is a perfect time to take control of our country by martial law. How could this happen? Hegelian Dialectic (sp?). Get the population to see a problem (or manufacture one), offer a solution and get them to ask for a cure that they would normally balk at. Thesis, anti-thesis,

synthesis.

Thesis -- We attack Iraq and Saddam (or maybe some special ops teams that just happen to look like they are from the middle-east) sends out a terror team to spread Anthrax throughout Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York City. Within a week, 25,000,000 of our population are dead and more are dying.

Anti-thesis-- Instead of asking why FEMA hadn't prepared for what our government knew would happen, our population screams that something has to be done to stop this from happening again. As the National Guard haul off the bodies for mass cremation, our illustrious president says that we will have a dusk-to-dawn curfew nationwide until further notice. After all, the anthrax is spread at night because it is most potent when sunlight hasn't hit it. At least that is what we will be told. We cannot have anymore of those terrorists spreading that nasty bug around. But people continue to drop like flies because the bug does persist. Food won't be arriving at the supermarket, the pharmacies have all been raided, food riots become widespread-there is a total breakdown coming if something isn't done quickly.

Synthesis--Martial Law. The population is screaming for it. The government must help us. We tell our leaders that we will do anything -- just stop the death. What was unthinkable and totally unacceptable two weeks prior is now being begged for.

All citizens are ordered to report to their local Post Office for registration. They are told they will be given food, antibiotics, and immunizations. As they are marched through, they are segregated into work groups. (Has anyone seen, "Schindler's List"?) The hard core patriots, militia, vocal anti-big-government types, veterans, gunowners and other potential troublemakers are separated out from the rest. They are told they will be sent to a re-education camp but many of them already know that they have a one way ticket. Some have heard of death camps with guillotines but thought it was just rumor. Most don't object -- they have spent their life in servitude and obedience to a dictatorial government and they won't muster the courage to fight back now.

Firearms are outlawed and weapon sweeps are made. Anyone that turns in a gunowner will receive extra rations. The penalty for possession of a firearm is summary execution.

Eventually the government "finds out" that a "fundamentalist Christian" group had released the anthrax. All Christians are told to report for re-indoctrination. The population is outraged and calls for wholesale slaughter of anyone who does not accept the new "World Religion". The mob screams for retribution and the government obliges. The death camps are doing their work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Nobody protests because the Bill of Rights does not exist anymore. Any comment about the government could get you sent to a death camp.

Just suppose -- no, this is America -- it couldn't happen here.

.

Concerning Larry Wayne Harris

THE HOFFMAN WIRE. Feb. 20, 1998. Michael A. Hoffman II, Editor

Of Anthrax and "Aryans"

By now most of you will have heard of the story about "white supremacists" supposedly plotting an anthrax attack on the subways of New York City. If one reads the "fine print" in these stories one discovers no evidence of intent or even possession, yet the report has gone around the world and is headlined in newspapers as far as Britain.

In 1993 a similarly hyped story appeared in the Los Angeles area about skinheads supposedly seeking to assassinate Rodney King and exterminate black people. The story was a hoax but it is still being repeated today. A revelation of a media hoax seldom gets the publicity that the original hoax itself did.

However, before we absolve the "Aryans" in question of all culpability in this Anthrax charade, we might wish to consider a bit of military and espionage history.

"Black ops" is a term for counter-intelligence operations from within enemy territory carried about by the enemy themselves and people posing as you. Nathan Bedford Forrest, a man with an I.Q. of probably 180 or more, quickly grasped the Black Ops game in his territory and disbanded the Ku Klux Klan as a result (because masked men who were not Klansmen were perpetrating atrocities in klan garb).

In the 1920s Soviet intelligence created an "anti-communist" organization which fed "intelligence" to the West vastly inflating the power of the White Army opposition and forecasting the fall of the Bolsheviks. This false flag set-up helped to deter Western anti-communists from assisting the White Army; they believed the war against Bolshevism was nearly won, so why bother.

Later, Stalin set-up another fake anti-communist underground and enticed anti-communists into it. After they were pumped for secrets and other information, they were executed.

The Oklahoma City bombing is a case of a conspiracy mounted by people who one would be hardpressed to describe as other than neo-Nazis, yet their role in the bombing has been protected by the US government itself.

Lenin coined the term "useful idiots" and that is what I believe some in the white separatist/Aryan Nations/neo-Nazi movement are vis a vis the establishment. They can always be counted on to serve as shills for the government.

Clinton needed state power expanded and the Murrah building went up in smoke in Oklahoma.

The American people shouted down three top government officials of Jewish extraction at Columbus, Ohio, and are generally demonstrating a weariness toward constant alarms about terrorism and what happens? Voila -- as if on cue-- "Aryan terrorists" appear out of the woodwork, supposedly implicated in an Anthrax attack.

The two men apprehended are probably not guilty of the crime they are accused of, but the leader is probably guilty of shooting his mouth off in a reckless and irresponsible manner, with statements that could easily be used to manufacture a media monster.

Folks, if you choose to represent our people in public you'd better damn sure know what you are doing and saying. If you need an exemplar, study the life of Ernst Zündel as revealed in my book, "The Great Holocaust Trial."

No one can accuse Ernst of being "soft" or compromising, but at the same time, his Canadian foes have never tried to implicate him in a terrorist act because the charge would be laughable. Like the vast majority of native Germans, Ernst is orderly and law-abiding. He is the bane of terrorism, not its advocate. Journalists, cops and activists have all come to know, Mr. Zündel has never advocated or counseled violence.

Hence the "Black Ops" can't use him or his trained cadre the way they use these Aryan Nations patsies.

I believe with Ernst Zündel that the worst possible development now is for separatists and other dissidents to be used as foils for the expansion of state power and the magnification of the media's atrocity propaganda.

At a news conference yesterday in Hayden, Idaho, Aryan Nations leader Mr. Richard Butler allegedly told reporters it was okay for people to possess anthrax.

Well, maybe it is. But to state that baldly, without elaboration or context is to play directly into the hands of the police state and the media by seeming to endorse "Aryan" terrorism.

Richard Butler is old, his I.Q. has never been too high. FBI and ATF agents swarm throughout the staff of his organization. Money always seems to materialize to keep the "Aryan Nations" organization going.

The government and the establishment media continue to use the Aryan Nations and similar groups in order to give a black eye to all of us who are simply normal, healthy people advocating the same sane, common-sense as our great-grandparents did on issues of race, religion and history.

Richard Butler recently called for a parade of costumed Nazis in Idaho on Hitler's birthday. One day after he did so his call was front page news in all local newspapers.

If this writer were to call for a revisionist history conference in Idaho, to discuss the history of one of America's first concentration camps -- a shameful facility which was built to imprison Coeur d'Alene's white miners and was policed exclusively by black troops -- I wouldn't get the time of day from the local newspapers.

Why? Because real revisionism and sane separatism do not press media buttons; they do not correpond with the Hollywood stereotype and script. They shatter the mind-control consensus and therefore such activists and campaigns are starved of publicity.

Terrorism is cowardice. It is the fighting method of aliens. I despise terrorism and I repudiate it. I will not knowingly give any tenor of approval to it in any form by any group.

We are to be a cut above the herd or we are nothing.

There is of course no true immunity from media lies. We have a public so drunk on illusion they wouldn't know the truth if it jumped up and bit them on the nose. They are immersed in "virtual reality, video reality, TV reality," all of which are lacking in reality.

The media shoot first and ask questions later. If you're pro-white or anti-Zionist you're at least a mental terrorist in their eyes from jump street.

But that's no reason for us to indulge their fantasies or to fail to discipline ourselves and our use of language or to tolerate or cooperate with groups that do not fully and completely condemn and repudiate terrorism.

Groups like Aryan Nations have done little more than build state power in America.

They have made feelings of white pride synonymous with ugliness, with Halloween, with publicity-hungry, obese, bearded cranks emerging out of masturbatory fantasy worlds and pressing the media's buttons in order to be famous for 15 minutes.

What a grotesque, disgusting disaster such people are for our movement.

I don't know how such people were raised. I know Germans traditionally are raised to put a premium on hard word and guarding one's mouth.

How wonderful if there was a tight-knit white separatist group in Idaho that operated a farm and fixed elderly white people's cars and houses for free; who raised barns and ran farm markets; who had lots of children and steered clear of gun-toting and the media.

>From such a group would come a true base for the future. Such a group would be a true alternative to this System.

Aryan Nations and their followers are mostly the lost children of the age, deeply wounded by rage but without sufficient internal resources to channel that rage into constructive outlets. They typically live a TV and media-saturated daily existence in which they are happy to serve the starring role in some Jewish script. They react blindly and without intelligence.

I have heard ghetto black youths speak with a greater sense of decorum and media-smarts than Aryan Nations members who seem to think it is "daring" and "courageous" to expound racial expletives to the absolute gratification of the media.

I'll tell you what takes courage--peaceable hard work, industry, application to a trade, sinking roots and building friendships based on that work that last longer than the flick of a CNN camera.

I see very little in America of white community, of the concept of a peaceable underground with its own codes, signals and members who are building a sustainable network for their children and for the future as they boycott the System (I do know of isolated pockets of individual families thus engaged).

Instead what is present is mostly media freaks drunk on false,

millennial prophecies of Apocalypse living like bums-in the moment--without a thought beyond the next year.

When Catherine the Great invited the Germans into hostile Russian territory as relative aliens among the Russian masses; the Germans came and got to work: they ploughed, they planted and they ended up running the joint.

Don't let the devils of Madison Avenue sell you on the idea that in this electronic freak-out age, long-range planning and building are useless.

I predict this old planet might just have another 500 years on it. I predict that if America is submerged in an alien tide there will be no national Armageddon, simply a Bombay process.

Go to India someday, see Bombay. By American standards the city shouldn't be running. But it is. A basket case? Definitely. Race and sectarian riots? Now and then. Corruption, murder? You bet!

But the System keeps chugging along. India's civilization may one day be America's. The notion of a predictive Apocalypse is of Jerry Falwell by way of the Learned Elders of Rapture. It is an enemy doctrine intended to keep you from every putting down deep roots and working for the long haul.

And terrorism? Even if those two guys had been thinking of using Anthrax on New Yorkers, could their violence ever equal the violence of one morning in Hiroshima, one afternoon in Beirut in August of 1982 or one night in Dresden in February, 1945?

Is not President Billy Goat Clinton plotting the murder of several thousand Iraqi women and children -- if not by Anthrax -- then by depleted uranium and massive bombing, just to please his masters in Tel Aviv who feel the camel-riders need a seasonal dose of genocide to keep them sufficiently awed. Let's face it, Arab blood is cheap.

The idea of Anthrax on New York City or Scud missiles on Jerusalem evokes paroxysms of outrage. Carpet bomb Iraq? Heh, why not, they're only towel-heads.

I am a Christian. One reason I am a Christian is because I believe Christ was the smartest man who ever lived. He said we should be wise as serpents.

Christ gave his followers a formula for building his movement that was invincible. It was this: to suffer for the sake of the truth. From the early Christians to the Quakers, when men saw other men suffering for conscience's sake, they sympathized and they even converted and joined.

Whether you are Christian or not, you might at least grasp that the "terrorist/killer" image is the nemesis of any small movement. It is the System's objective to forever tar us with that stigma even as they blithely pimp for the incineration of Baghdad.

Yes, we face incredible odds and a terrible foe but we can master both if we act like what we claim to represent--decency, civilization and law.

And if we truly intend to be separate, let's start by separating ourselves from the retarded "Aryan" robots whose idea of resistance is to act on a Zionist stage, speaking lines from an FBI script, saving Clinton from a public relations disaster in Ohio while making Federal agents appear as noble guardians of public safety.

Just published-Michael A. Hoffman II's Revisionist History #5

HAMMERED!

The Inside Story of the Top Communist Operative
Who Groomed Al Gore to Rule a Soviet America

This is the most comprehensive investigative report on Armand Hammer and Al Gore Jr. in print. Section headings include: I. KGB Asset Al Gore Sr. II. Gore, Hammer and Gadhafi. III. Learning Lenin's Iron Law of Conspiracy. IV. Operation Elders of Zion. V. Zion's Stealth Candidate.

As the Clinton administration sinks under a load of scandal, all eyes are focused on his possible successor. But the skeletons in Gore's own closet may prove to be the far greater liability.

Not available online. Hardcopy only. Revisionist History newsletter Issue #5. "Hammered!" \$6.50 postpaid. Independent History, Box 849, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83816. (Overseas send U.S.\$10).

=====

The preceding information is courtesy of THE HOFFMAN WIRE.
Michael A. Hoffman II, Editor. Copyright©1998. The Hoffman Wire is distributed by THE CAMPAIGN FOR RADICAL TRUTH IN HISTORY at <http://www.hoffman-info.com> and is maintained by donations.

Send \$2.00 for a catalog of Mr. Hoffman's books, tapes and magazines or make a donation to: P.O. Box 849, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83816 U.S.A.

To be added to our electronic mailing list send the message "Subscribe me" to hoffman@hoffman-info.com To be removed from the list, send the message, "Unsubscribe me."

.



.

The Conspiracy Against Larry Harris

.

From: TWStough@aol.com
Date: Tue, 24 Feb 1998 19:36:58 EST
To: TWStough@aol.com
Subject: **THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST LARRY HARRIS**
-- Dr. Len Horowitz Co-Author**THE CONSPIRACY REGARDING LARRY HARRIS**

By

Terry W. Stough, B.A., M.H.A.
Founder, The American Resistance Movement
An Organization Supporting Lawful, Constitutional Government
9118 Carroll Manor Drive
Atlanta, Georgia 30350
(770) 641-9042
<http://members.aol.com/TWStough/main.htm>

And

Leonard G. Horowitz, D.M.D., M.A., M.P.H.
President, Tetrahedron, Inc.
a nonprofit educational corporation
P. O. Box 402
Rockport, MA 01966
508-546-6586
<http://www.tetrahedron.org>

With Input From

Doug Millar, Investigator / Researcher
Dallas, Texas

Dave Adair / U.S. Government Aerospace Expert
Hollywood, California

Expressly prepared for immediate release by news agencies through
the world.

Introduction For The Clarification

For months the two authors of this report have been at odds regarding issues concerning Larry Harris. However, due to a chance meeting in Daytona Beach, Florida at the Global Sciences Conference, on Sunday night, February 22, 1998, the authors had a frank and broad reaching discussion of the issues raised in each of our earlier written reports. This discussion involved input from over a dozen participants at the Global Sciences Conference. As a result of this discussion and a mutual attempt to resolve issues and find common ground, we were able to uncover additional facts which should enlighten those seeking a more complete understanding of the true enemy Mr. Harris faces. This information bridges the gap between the supporters of Len Horowitz and those of Larry Harris who have thus far been at odds, so that we can all work together in greater harmony against a common enemy.

As part of our intention to act in good faith toward a resolution of these conflicts, it was agreed that both sides of these issues would supply new information believed to be accurate and that each side would place its credibility on the table with respect to the accuracy and verifiability of the facts contained herein.

Further, it was learned during the meeting that when Larry Harris would do a media interview, faxes questioning the credibility of Larry Harris would be sent which purportedly originated from Dr. Horowitz. Dr. Horowitz was unaware of any such faxes. The Harris supporters had originally believed that these faxes were actually sent by Dr. Horowitz, and believed as well that Dr. Horowitz had a large intelligence network

at his disposal in an attempt to discredit Larry Harris. Attempts are currently underway to determine the source of these faxes that may show CIA involvement in efforts to use Dr. Horowitz to discredit Larry Harris.

Background Of The Original Document

Since mid-1997, two papers posted on Dr. Horowitz's Internet site (tetrahedron.org_"Research, News and Views Page"_ FTP Public Access files) predicted that, at the right time, Larry Harris might be used by U.S. intelligence agencies for propaganda purposes in the realm of biological terrorism. This prediction was based on several facts as detailed below. It is currently our contention that Mr. Harris was set up by agents for the CIA in an effort to instill fear of a biological attack in the minds of the public; thus supporting the propaganda arm of the Clinton administration, in favor of Gulf war efforts. The authors agree that Mr. Harris has been operating in good faith, and if his activities have been manipulated by agents of the CIA, then Mr. Harris is most likely unaware of this.

Dr. Horowitz's prediction of Larry Harris's use by American intelligence for propaganda came true on Feb. 18, 1998 with his false arrest by the FBI for suspected possession of anthrax. The prediction by Leonard Horowitz was based on a number of factors. The first was that Mr. Harris previously worked as a biological warfare researcher for the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) (*1) Second, Mr. Harris had made statements regarding knowledge of a terrorist organization that was threatening to deploy biological weapons, such as anthrax and bubonic plague, against the American people. Third, Harris clearly stated and warned against the threat of biological terrorism against the U.S. These statements were highly consistent with U.S. propaganda campaigns that had already been initiated by official propaganda sources. Fourth, Harris had claimed expertise in the area of in biological weapons (*2) Fifth, Harris was previously arrested in connection with obtaining bubonic plague microorganisms (*3) Sixth, Mr. Harris believed that there was a threat from Iraqi nationals bringing biological weapons into this country rather than the belief held by Dr. Horowitz that the CIA was directly linked to the production and illegal use of biological weapons (BW) (*4) Finally, Mr. Harris had provided specific details regarding the manufacture and distribution of biochemical weapons through his lectures and audiotapes.

It was this last fact that largely generated concern on Dr. Horowitz's part. Mr. Harris's supporters, however, concluded that this knowledge was already in the hands of terrorist organizations, and Mr. Harris was distributing this information in an effort to inform the American people of the ease with which these weapons could be created and utilized.

It was logical to conclude that Larry Harris could be easily used by the propaganda arm of American intelligence. However, as was discussed, had it not been Larry Harris delivering this information, the CIA was likely to have broadcast this information in some other way and/or substituted another person to deliver its messages, in furtherance of it's purposes.

Headline News and the Need for Biological Propaganda

On Feb. 19, 1998 the news media announced that Larry Harris, along with another microbiologist, William "Job" Leavitt, had been arrested on the afternoon of Wednesday, Feb. 18. The charge was

suspected possession of deadly anthrax spores.

Both Dr. Horowitz and the supporters of Mr. Harris immediately recognized the use of this story as a propaganda ploy. The headlines in USA Today for example, was released simultaneously with the headline "Last chance for diplomacy?" All participants in the debate concluded that this was no coincidence. The fact that Larry Harris was setup and arrested at the most critical moment in U.N./Iraqi diplomatic efforts -- when U.S. propaganda against Saddam Hussein peaked -- on the eve of Secretary General Kofi Annan's final diplomatic effort for peace and when American anxiety regarding "imminent" war and resulting threats of biological terrorism in the U.S. peaked.

Largely overlooked was the fact that: 1) production and use of BW by any country was a violation of the standing Geneva Accord; 2) American corporations have been a principal Iraqi supplier of BW along with the reagents and culture mediums required to produce them; 3) President Clinton had been advised that such massively destructive agents can be inexpensively cultured in any large kitchen today; 4) and the hardware used to produce these "weapons of mass destruction" can be easily moved within hours of an impending inspection. In light of the futility of periodic U.N./American inspections of Iraqi facilities something was clearly amiss. Clearly, to make the American people support the U.S. war effort, intelligence and counterintelligence activities would be required.

Moreover, following the Ohio State "Town Hall Meeting" two days earlier, it became painfully obvious to the Clinton administration that Americans, if not the world, needed additional persuasion to endorse the bombing of Iraq. To secure public support for the futile if not senseless inspections, and/or military attacks in Iraq, both Dr. Horowitz and the supporters of Larry Harris recognized that the CIA turned to the propaganda use and exploitation of Mr. Harris.

Previous and Current Events

Precedent exists for such a conspiracy theory. Recall that on the eve of the Bush administration's desire to invade Iraq in 1990, the American people required similar persuasion. The public relations firm of Hill and Knowlton was immediately summoned. Within hours they filmed a Kuwaiti Prince's niece alleging she saw Saddam Hussein's elite guardsmen torturing and maiming babies, pulling them from incubators, stabbing them, then throwing them from windows.

The American people were aghast. War polls shot up favorably. President Bush declared, "This aggression will not stand!" Then the war began. Following the conflict it was determined that this entire Hill and Knowlton/Bush administration story was fabricated. Americans quickly forgot and history has repeated itself.

Enter Mr. Ronald Rockwell.

As was indicated in the original press release on this issue by Mr. Harris's supporters, Mr. Harris and Mr. Leavitt were arrested following a tip by Mr. Rockwell -- an FBI informant of dubious integrity and a jaded history; an extortion felon convicted in 1981 and 1982. Rockwell told "NBC Nightly News" on Friday (Feb. 20, 1998) that the thought of Harris and Leavitt coming to his facility with military grade anthrax "scared me so bad" he called the FBI.

This statement has many problems. First, Mr. Rockwell knew that the purpose of the experiments was to find a way to kill anthrax. Second, in order to do so, Larry Harris would have to use samples of an organism (in this case, non-weapons grade agricultural anthrax).

Third, it was Mr. Rockwell, not Mr. Harris, who encouraged the testing for a potential sale. According to Mr. Harris's intimates \$20,000,000 was the total price for the instrument's purchase.

Reported to be a cancer researcher and businessman, Mr. Rockwell, was said to have developed the AZ-58 Ray Tube Frequency Instrument Prototype. He alleged this device was able to remove bacteria and viruses including "ANTHRAX" from "large numbers of people at the same time."

Mr. Leavitt is said to have contacted Mr. Harris for help with the test. How did Mr. Leavitt learn of Mr. Harris? According to a personal acquaintance of Mr. Leavitt who requested anonymity, as witnessed by our groups, George Green introduced the two men. It is known that Mr. Green, an alleged book publisher, was a personal acquaintance of Mr. Rockwell. Both men frequented Neo-nazi organizational meetings. Mr. Harris likewise attended some Neo-nazi meetings, but in another state.

Several individuals attending the Global Sciences Conference were aware that Mr. Green was frequent involved in questionable financial dealings. Moreover, another anonymous source revealed that Mr. Green had reported being asked by George Bush to head the President's finance committee.

A written statement submitted by Doug Millar, a conference participant, and also an acquaintance of Mr. Rockwell, provided further revealing insights. He wrote:

"As a full time investigator of violent crimes against children, I have met some of the most interesting, important, weird, unusual and criminal minds in America. At a meeting I was speaking at in Las Vegas last summer, a man came forward who claimed to know a lot about the subject and about Las Vegas. He said that Ron Rockwell referred him to our event. We met the next morning to discuss what he knew. He started discussing racist issues and branched into neo-Nazi comments. As someone who studied to become an FBI agent for a couple of years in college, you learn to build trust with people before they are willing to expose their inner secrets.

Although I was raised to have contempt for racists and am a member of the NAACP, I feigned interest, because I wanted to find out why Rockwell referred such a despicable man to me. Soon he was telling me about his meetings at conventions with Mitzgar, David Duke, etc.. He had also known [a] Rockwell, the founder of the American Nazi Party who was killed 25-30 years ago. Since he said he spent a lot of time in Vegas, I told him a story that was in the local newspaper announcing that the owner of the Imperial Palace Casino & Hotel had celebrated Hitler's birthday with a party at the casino and Las Vegas strip. Then I asked him the main purpose of my main fishing expedition, "Where did you meet Ron Rockwell?" He shocked me with his answer, "At a local Nazi meeting!" As someone who had been invited to Rockwell's home to see the Rife technology a couple of times, I can state that I know many people who agree with the statement of one of the top retired law enforcement agency officials in America who told me, I know you can't believe anything Rockwell says!' I certainly agree with that conclusion!"

Another participant in the discussion, Dave Adair, one of America's leading aerospace experts, and frequent U.S. government/space industry consultant, indicated that he had seen and recognized unique equipment that Mr. Rockwell displayed during a previous Global Sciences

meeting. Mr. Adair knew that the equipment was build exclusively for the National Security Agency (NSA). The equipment was classified hardware that could only have been obtained by a U.S. government agent with high level security clearances. Mr. Adair stated that he had asked Mr. Rockwell, "What agency are you with?" Mr. Rockwell refused to answer his question, then walked away.

Mr. Adair also testified to ABC news that Mr. Harris's arrest on Feb. 19, 1998 was a "set up."

According to USA Today (Feb. 20 p. 10A) "Leavitt's two lawyers, Lamond Mills and Kirby Wells, suggested Leavitt may have been duped and set up by Rockwell. According to attorney Mills, Rockwell was trying to "scam" Leavitt into buying the bogus germ-killing machine. (AP--Sat., Feb. 21, in The Daytona News-Journal, p. 3A.) They said Leavitt is an "honest businessman" here who had been negotiating with Rockwell to invest in his new technology and had hired Harris as a consultant. They said Harris had brought harmless anthrax vaccine from Ohio to test the technology. They suggested Rockwell told the FBI a different story in order to get publicity."

Publicity indeed, but not for the AZ-58.

Rockwell, a cancer researcher, businessman, and "scam" artist, would be intelligent enough to know that such a stunt would likely backfire given his earlier felony conviction. He would again risk facing criminal charges following a thorough FBI investigation. That is, unless the FBI were also involved in the ruse. On the other hand, if the machine really cleared viruses and bacteria, including "ANTHRAX" from people's blood, and Rockwell was a smart businessman, then he would expect Mr. Leavitt and Mr. Harris to test the machine with the agents he advertised it cleared: "ANTHRAX." As a cancer and microbiology researcher, the thought of a prospective buyer bringing "military grade" anthrax in for such a trial should not have alarmed him. So why then, other than to trigger a propaganda campaign, did Mr. Rockwell alert the FBI?

In any case, Mr. Rockwell's story, and his actions, are suspicious if not incriminating. Had Mr. Rockwell become an FBI informant earlier than reported? Perhaps during a plea bargain that may have occurred in the wake of his 1982 conviction. Could he be linked to the CIA?

In this case the FBI may have been involved with the CIA, or duped by them, in a conspiracy to generate biological terrorism propaganda. Investigators should carefully examine Mr. Rockwell's history for intelligence agency links.

It was also suspicious that following three days of studying Mr. Harris's anthrax vaccine, "CNN Headline News" reported (on Saturday) that United States Army researchers, supporting the FBI's investigation, were uncertain of their test results. This is particularly strange given that anthrax is an easy germ to identify. Can you imagine the risk to U.S. forces in the Gulf if it took more than three days to confirm an anthrax attack!

Finally, late Saturday night, "CNN Headline News" reported that the substance in question was indeed an anthrax vaccine, and that Mr. Leavitt had been freed. Leavitt stated that under the circumstances, the FBI could not be blamed for his mistaken arrest. Mr. Harris was still under arrest, however. This report followed promising news regarding Kofi Annan's diplomatic efforts in Iraq. U.N. officials were confident Saddam Hussein would comply with their inspection requirements.

The friends of Larry Harris are currently concerned about Mr. Harris's

treatment under custody. Allegations have surfaced that Mr. Harris has been a member of the Aryan Nations, a white supremacist group. The long time friends of Larry Harris have reported that this information has been fabricated, as they have no knowledge of such membership.

Conclusion

Any way you look at it, the effect this predicted episode had on the public's mind, and fear level, was consistent with the effects of psychological warfare. Today the threat of domestic bioterrorism looms greater than ever not because of Larry Harris, but because of his manipulators.

About Leonard G. Horowitz: Leonard G. Horowitz, D.M.D., M.A., M.P.H. is a Harvard graduate, independent investigator, and internationally known authority in public health education. One of healthcare's most captivating speakers, his book *Emerging Viruses: AIDS & Ebola--Nature, Accident or Intentional?* (Tetrahedron, Inc., 1998), now a bestselling hardcover, is available through any bookstore on request, or by calling the publisher's toll free order line 1-888-508-4787. For Dr. Horowitz's availability as a speaker please call 1-800-336-9266; and for his audiotapes and videotapes including: *Emerging Viruses and Vaccinations* and *Gulf War Syndrome: The Spreading Epidemic Cover-up*, please call 1-888-508-4787.

About Terry W. Stough: Although Terry Stough possesses substantial knowledge of health related issues (Masters of Health Administration, former Administrator of major Atlanta hospital, etc.) he does not claim any expertise in the technical issues under discussion. Instead, Terry's focus in this area has been to help disseminate information on these issues to the public. He is extremely pleased with the progress made as a result of the discussion between parties who have far more in common than the minor differences between them. Terry's main focus is to work for the restoration of lawful government.

Footnotes

1 Larry Harris's resume is available on request by contacting Terry Stough.

2 Items are available to lend support for Mr. Harris's knowledge in the field of microbiology.

3 Regarding the prior arrest, Larry Harris was convicted of wire fraud under an obscure "blue law" which required you to leave your name and phone number when you leave a message on an interstate call. The charge had nothing to do with possession of biological agents. As a economic, etc. decision, he decided to plead guilty to this charge in exchange for community service and probation. As a result of the probation, he was required to report all activities including the purpose and timing of his latest trip to Las Vegas which resulted in his rearrest.

4 Dr. Horowitz's beliefs were based largely on evidence compiled during the Frank Church Congressional investigation into the illegal storage and use of biological weapons by the CIA long after the signing of the Geneva Accord. For details, see Dr. Horowitz's book, *Emerging Viruses: AIDS & Ebola_Nature, Accident or Intentional?*

.

.

Common-Sense Evacuation of Biowar-Contaminated Areas

.

Date: Sun, 22 Feb 1998 08:57:55 -0800
From: wolfeyes (wolfeyes@cdsnet.net)
Reply-To: wolfeyes@cdsnet.net

NOTE: Deep013 is an enormously valuable source of no-nonsense information. While I know nothing about him personally, I do know how to tell the difference between BS and the real thing. Deep013 is the real thing. -- Carl F. Worden

From: Deep013@aol.com
To: wolfeyes@cdsnet.net
Cc: eagleflt@eagleflt.com

Dear Carl: I hope this will do for now. Please send it to your friend.
Dave: please repost

Dear (deleted):

My colleague in Oregon has asked if I wouldn't mind sharing a few thoughts with you on the subject of preparedness for biological events. I'm sure you won't mind if I omit your name from this reply and forward it to the public lists as it seems likely that others may also share your concern.

To begin with, it should be understood that we are talking about military events and not natural phenomena. Anthrax and humanity have managed to exist side-by-side for millennia without exterminating one or the other. Yes, some people do sicken and perhaps die every year from anthrax. Into each life, however, a little rain must fall and there is no way short of an apartment in outer space to avoid occasional contact between the human species and the anthrax virus.

Anthrax as a weapon was first developed by the British during World War II. Although highly tempted by this weapon's effectiveness and the execrable nature of its nazi opponent, the British elected to forego using anthrax for two reasons -- increasingly-satisfactory progress in winning the war through conventional means and the possibility of

retaliation. Germany is densely populated but Great Britain even more so. Another factor that weighed against its use was the persistent nature of anthrax "infection" of an area.

The remote Scottish isle which was used as a testing ground by the British remains uninhabitable to this day. Despite the menace of nazism, Great Britain magnanimously chose not to bequeath vast tracts of diseased wasteland as a lasting legacy to generations of as-yet-unborn, and therefore innocent, Germans (and Britons).

The danger from a military perspective lies in the concentration of the spores in a general area. By this I mean that there is only a limited danger from one anthrax spore per acre. That one spore is only going to catch one victim and only under an extremely improbable combination of circumstances and plain old bad luck. Put 10,000,000 spores in that acre and you now have a much greater chance of stumbling across the one that has your name on it. These things don't have legs but once there in that acre they are going to be staying for a long, long time.

Fighting a victorious anthrax campaign here at home therefore breaks down into two major areas of preparedness: early detection and prompt evacuation.

Although I have no understanding of the prevailing winds in your area of the nation, there is bound to be a seasonal pattern. Let us say, for example, that the autumn winds blow generally from the north and west, as they do here in Colorado. A "downwind" anthrax attack to the south and east of you would therefore pose little direct risk. An "upwind" attack, perhaps on a major city directly to the north of you, would require increased scrutiny of that day's particular weather patterns, a determination of the risk of staying put or an acceptance of the need for escape and an assessment of where would be the likeliest place to safely evacuate to.

You have generously offered a safe refuge to many of your friends and family but unfortunately, once contaminated on a military scale, your happy home will be of no further use to you ever again. No matter how well-sealed or properly-stocked your residence may be, the large concentrations of anthrax in a militarily-infected area will persist and will eventually claim even the best-prepared group. **YOU MUST GET OUT OF THE INFECTED OR SOON-TO-BE-INFECTED AREA AT ONCE!!!!**

This evacuation would ideally take place long before the anthrax spores, drifting lazily on the wind from their point of release a hundred or so miles away, reach your neighborhood. There is an old Chinese proverb that says: "A wise man is prepared to abandon his baggage once or twice in a lifetime." If you hear of an upwind attack, don't wait. Jump in the car, roll up the windows, and don't stop for gas or to use the restroom. Drive on and devil take the hindmost.

Suppose, however, that you wake up in the morning and hear about an overnight incident in that city to the north of you. By now, perhaps, local areas are already beginning to experience deposition of biological agents. You still need to get out of town, but now you need to get out of town "slowly". Don't panic. Close all the doors and windows and keep everyone inside. Hopefully you have a vehicle sitting in your attached garage.

Get everyone inside the car. Use a roll of duct tape to seal all of the door cracks and around the edges of all the windows except the driver's door window. Seal the heater's air intake vent (that grate just underneath the windshield wipers). Climb inside your open driver's side window and roll it up. Use more of your duct tape to

seal this window from the inside. Hit your garage door opener, start the car, and head for the hills.

Be aware that a tightly-sealed vehicle can eventually generate large quantities of carbon monoxide so get out of the "downwind" track of the anthrax as soon as possible. If you need to replenish the air supply in your passenger compartment before getting to safety, bring the vehicle to a complete stop, preferably under some sort of overhead shelter -- underneath a bridge or a gas station canopy, and then open your driver's side window. A wet towel can perhaps be used as an improvised air filter. Once the air is renewed, roll your window back up, retape the edges and drive on.

In the event of heightened international tensions, a specially-prepared "survival vehicle" could be readied for use. In addition to the above preparations, NBC-rated masks and disposable suits could be stored inside the vehicle along with some necessary survival supplies, changes of clothes and shoes, first-aid supplies, a firearm or two, important family legal documents, valuables and heirlooms and perhaps some spare gas cans. Double-wrapping all items in sealed garbage bags wouldn't hurt. If the best you can do for overgarments is dust masks and disposable paper suits from a paint store, then use these. A box of garbage bags and some rolls of duct tape are excellent materials for the improvisation of emergency escape suits if you have nothing else.

A military-style overpressure generation system for the passenger compartment can be improvised through a bottle of compressed air or oxygen. This system, wherein the valve of the bottle is cracked just slightly open, raises the atmospheric pressure inside the compartment to a level slightly higher than that outside the compartment. Any "bugs" or viruses that waft their way towards your vehicle are going to have to swim "upstream" to get through that river of air rushing out of all the miniscule crevices-- a rather unlikely proposition. Be aware of the increased fire and explosion hazard if you use pure oxygen for your overpressure system. Compressed air would be best. Use oxygen only as an emergency alternative. Don't raise the pressure so high as to cause damage to your health, particularly eardrums, or so that you run out of overpressure perhaps when you need it the most. Just enough and no more. Gauges from an oxy-acetylene welding kit could be used to measure the available supply of overpressure and regulate its expenditure.

As I am writing "off the cuff", I have no idea of the best possible psi setting for this sort of usage but it shouldn't be too hard to discover through asking questions of a local science teacher or by simple experimentation. The important thing is to have the hardware available. Knowledge of the proper settings on the gauge but no bottle of compressed air will be of much less use than a bottle of compressed air and no idea of the proper psi setting. Use your head and be careful when experimenting. Work your way up gradually. Don't blow the windows out of your station wagon. This means that you have TOO MUCH overpressure.

Once a safe area is reached, possibly at an established "decontamination site" on the perimeter of the exposed area, you should expect to abandon your "contaminated" vehicle. Being able to prove that your personal goods were stowed ahead of time and double-sealed might enable you to keep them from being confiscated. Another solution might be to "drop them off" somewhere close to the reception area prior to reporting in and quietly retrieving them later. Government civil defense manuals generally recommend the disarming of refugees in fallout shelters and I would imagine that a similar policy would be in effect at these reception sites. Keep

this in mind and make your own plans accordingly.

All of the above is written not as an exhaustive remedy for biological contamination but merely as my own thoughts that have occurred to me during composition of this letter. I am sure that I have omitted much and perhaps given some inaccurate advice here and there. As is the case with practically everyone else, I am no expert on the subject of biological weapons and fervently hope that I never have the opportunity to become one. Others with more knowledge may perhaps be kind enough to forward corrections, improvements, or denials and thus we may all end up with an increased understanding of the most useful preparations to take in the event of an actual emergency, however unlikely its occurrence may be.

To sum up, I would urge you not to "make a stand" against biological weapons. Long distance is much, much better than being there. If your home is in the path of a biological delivery system, it is going to be permanently, irretrievably lost to you and you must not allow sentimental attachment to stand in the way of the safety of yourself, your family or your friends.

My own personal feeling is that a biological attack from Saddam Hussein is not quite as likely to occur as is an invasion from Mars but that is a subject which requires a detailed marshaling of previous history, present trends, and personal motivations to explain properly and will therefore have to wait for a day or so.

Although this may not be the advice you were expecting to receive, I hope that it is nevertheless of value to you.

The Union forever

.

.



.

Return Fire! -- Letters to the Editor

To: "Martin Lindstedt" (mlindste@clandjop.com)
Subject: In parting

Martin:

Your stand on biological warfare has crossed the line, in my opinion. It's one thing to have the heart and soul of a warrior, as I'm sure you believe you have. Terrorism, however, is not a discipline for warriors.

A warrior knows who his enemies are, and I think you do. However, he also attacks his enemies and avoids inflicting damage that does not directly advance his objective. Biological weapons are useless in that regard.

A warrior must determine what it is that matters most to his enemy, and attack it with sufficient credible force to cause the enemy to lose sight of his own strategic objectives. If what you say about the current American regime is true, your enemy couldn't care less about collateral casualties from a bio attack. He'll simply hold the perpetrators up as monsters to be wiped out (as he did some of the OKC perps), and he'll wipe them out with the blessing of the sheeple.

After your hypothetical bio attack on major cities, your hypothetical demand for the heads of the regime's officials would be met, not with craven compliance, but with howls for your hypothetical head.

Wherever you're going with this, I for one will not follow. You're not aiming to overturn a regime -- you're seeking a false dream of martyrdom.

=====

First of all, I have a good deal of respect for the person who wrote the above letter to me, and shall, unless he requests otherwise, let his name remain anonymous. Having a respect for that person, I feel that I cannot just blast him for his prejudices held in common with the common man, but must answer directly his points brought forward, as they are held in common by the mass humanity of today's middle element.

First of all, a lot of people think that my stand on biological warfare, as enunciated above, is beyond the Pale. So let me reiterate my stand once again:

- 1) Biological warfare, as it is cheap and strategically effective, can be used by practically anyone or everyone who has a grievance against a criminal regime or government.
- 2) Sooner or later it will be used to effect.
- 3) Therefore (and this is what I hear the bitching about), it is imperative that the Resistance develop, and implement as necessary, such biological weaponry.

So let me show why the third premise is both moral and necessary.

The writer of the above letter makes the mistake, common in a decaying democracy, of equating morality with majority rule. That which would be criminal is acceptable if a majority can be found to ratify such behavior. It is also an unspoken assertion that the

majority has immunity for their ratification of official misconduct. Hence there is "good" terrorism and "bad" terrorism; any extermination of the majority by those who would fight fire with fire is morally unacceptable. Such is the morality of the pack of dogs running and killing sheep; such is the morality of a lynch mob hiding behind white sheets; such is the morality of a decaying democracy's police forces burning down a church. The dogs (and their owners) will feel unjustly treated if you were to shoot them as they run home after their sheep-killing. The KKK would foam at the mouth if some nigger were to firebomb their Klavern at the Wednesday nite meeting before a mere cross burning. And the good voters and Clinton supporters can be counted to foam at the mouth and blame Iraqis and militiamen when the big cities are inevitably biowarred. There is the feeling -- common with both dogs and low-grade humanity -- that the anonymity of the pack for criminal activity performed in common should confer immunity from justice.

There is no such thing as "good" terrorism or "bad" terrorism. Terrorism is simply the use of violence or the threat of violence to obtain political results. Power is the measure of applied terrorism. One cannot have power without using terrorism. Power is making people do what they would not otherwise do unless they were terrorized into doing it.

Terror is a neutral concept. There is no such objective thing as "good" terrorism or "bad" terrorism.

Whenever necessary, I threaten my two-year-old grand-daughter to stop playing with the shortwave radio antenna. She has already bent the antenna. When the threat of a spanking doesn't achieve results, then the child is swatted, picked up, and locked out of the room wherein the shortwave radio is stored. Normally, she would, if allowed to do so, break off the remaining antenna. So her normal behavior towards a destructive curiosity has been modified by my use, or the threat of it, of force. Similarly, I have spanked the child for running out into the street without adult supervision, having made it a policy that she understands.

Now I could justify my use of force to bend my granddaughter to my will as being "for her own good." I do so all the time. But yet is not the same analogy used by the police forces of the current regime in their usages of force and violence? That such is used to justify the usage of violence against the individual "for his own good" and "for the good of society?" Of course it is. We have seen the murder by gas and fire of the Waco children under color of Janet Reno's professed concern for their safety. Thus a hired police soldiery, Patrick Henry's "Engines of Despotism" are used to collect taxes and for the [law-] enforcement of the will of those people in power. We live under a police state. Some of us have had enough of it.

So the imposition of terror is the only reason for a soldier or a policeman to exist. An efficient soldier studies how to impose terror or its threat so that the enemy won't have the will to fight. Thus the study of how to efficiently implement terror is the PRIMARY, maybe ONLY, discipline or study for a soldier. The only room for the consideration of morality is for the soldier to decide which side he is on.

So which side, my friend, are you on? That is the only moral question left.

In a decayed society which has willingly embraced a police state -- a leviathan of lawlessness -- who are the enemies of the individual who would live in freedom? And the answer is that state and that society. A police state consists of a war of each against all. Since this police state is indeed a democracy in its final stages of decay, with not one Adolph Hitler in charge

holding final responsibility but rather 100 million little hitlers voting against individual survival, a weapon such as biological warfare wherein the individual can effectively retaliate against the amoral majority of mass man is by definition targeted against the right and responsible target. If society is at war with the individual and would put him to death or take away his liberty or property, by what moral consideration could the masses complain about their destruction at the hands of an individual or smaller tribe? In a social order wherein might makes right, as is used to justify the tyranny of the masses, when might swings over to the militarized minority then there cannot be any moral reasoning for complaint against retaliatory destruction.

For those who would claim some nebulous moral superiority for the lives of the masses against that of the individual, let me remind them that Christianity is founded upon the principal that the life of one superlative individual is worth that of all of humanity. Those who would find fault with such a moral implication of the value of the individual over that of the corrupt herd should quarrel with Christ and God over such moral judgments.

Likewise, as this particular nation-state was founded upon a basis of at least professed Christianity, it is the value of the individual, his quality, which is the professed foundation of the founding documents, which proclaim the moral worth of the individual over the mass collective. It is the decay of Christianity paralleling the decay of the old civic religion which is behind the rationale of a New World Order allowed absolute power with minimal responsibility ruled by an oligarchy of the base which has brought about the current political disorder which will end in disaster. Woe unto them who sowed the wind which became a whirlwind!

So given the current reality, why should I rail against the means of the coming destruction? Even if I had power to disclaim a just vengeance committed through the agency of a Resistance Action Force cell (which I do not, as I am a Resistance Political Front operative) why should I? Does it really matter to you all that much as to whether mass man and mass 'civilization' is destroyed by the superlative outpourings of this criminal regime's Marburg-Smallpox-HIV genetically spliced viral agents as opposed to the cruder Iraqi VX anthrax, (which has the benefit of a U.S. Army pedigree) or even more crude Resistance anthrax strains? Would you not be as dead?

Far better to understand the realities of biological warfare and take certain common-sense steps such as living away from Sodom and Gomorrah, and preparation in imposing a tight quarantine free from contagion.

Now as whether you believe that the current regime would be so foolish as to biowar a major (or minor) city or two and blame it on Iraqis, militiamen, or any other enemies of the regime is irrelevant. But yet they are indeed just that idiotic in their murderous pursuit of power. They were stupid enough to pull a Waco, weren't they? And compound their stupidity in blowing up the support columns of that OKC federal building and blaming it on their Manchurian Oswald McVeigh. This stupidity of theirs polarized the country, separated the Resistance element from the politically correct militia generals and CONstitutional idolators, and brought forth a cold sweat on the part of the regime criminals as to whether their Manchurian Oswald would spill the beans at his show-trial and bring down the regime in a welter of civil warfare.

There is no doubt that the current regime criminals, Democrat or Republican, same thing, are so stupid and criminal that they would indeed biowar a major city other than Washington or New York. Would the patsies or manchurian oswalds be blamed and

executed forthwith? Of course. But what would the score be? Enemies of the state a half-million [corpses], state regime five?

In any case, the regime criminals would lose. A number of people, the fighting element first, would blame the criminal regime for the biowar, the same way a number of us place blame upon the regime for Waco and OKC. Additionally, since the only defense against biowar is quarantine, the coming biowar will favor the Resistance elements living in rural areas, prepared in both temperament and prior supply for a survival strategy. The survivors of direct biowar attack will be those who have superior resistance to disease, much like the survivors of the Black Death were. So given these characteristics of the surviving elements, Resistance and victim, what do you think will happen to the "leadership" of this country given that they will end up being the scapegoats for the war they caused?

What would you do if you come across a nest of these vipers living high in their subterranean refuges with plentiful food and antibiotics against the disease they spread that had killed your family and friends? What if this nest of vipers was a bi-partisan effort, if you seen Newt alongside of Chelsea? Would it be enough to make you at least swear off of Republican Party fundraisers?

As for the advisability of Resistance counter-biowarring major cities unless regime heads are collected, let me explain further. As said before, such a Resistance option shouldn't be pursued unless and until the major infestations in Washington and New York City are first cleared up. In any case, biowar politics is such that usually no warning whatsoever is given, as the purpose of biowar is the destruction of that particular population and its ruling regime criminals. This is particularly the case if it is the Resistance, the Iraqis, who which launch that particular biowar.

It might even be some crazed lunatic, maddened by injustice and gaining something better than a post-office special, who launches a biowar. In which case he might not help but claim credit for that attack, launched in his grim vengeful purpose by regime injustice. Does anyone really think that Carl Drega or the Connecticut Lotto official shooter was one of the Resistance? They weren't! Yet a vast number of us take immense personal satisfaction from regime criminals getting theirs from their suicidal victims who snap!! The only annoyance that I have with JJ Johnson is that he apologized for wanting to name every street in Amerika "Carl Drega Avenue!!!" You can count on myself and the smarter of the Resistance Political Front to call for the stacking of regime criminal heads on the kort-house lawn as penance for evil whenever the political moment is right. A Revolutionists' solution ALWAYS is the extermination of the criminal oligarchy.

But to further answer your question, options such as trading regime criminal heads for forbearance from biowar is one which would only be offered to major cities which the Resistance biowarrior was inclined to spare. In the event that the messenger was murdered, the likely penalty for killing this ambassador would be that the next ten cities would be offered no such option.

In any case, the rulers of the cities have always had to act as hostage for the conduct of their cities. This moral reality has been lost while under the spell of criminal democratic poly-ticks, so much so that the black-robed judicial baal-priests have declared themselves, prosecutors, police, and city legistraitors immune for their official misconduct. (See the week of March 2, 1998's Supreme Kort decisions for confirmation.) So if it means the survival of you and your family as opposed to the survival of the local state-god baal-priesthood and their families, does anyone really think that they would harbor a regime

criminal at such expense? Not to mention that there are some people who would welcome such a biowar directive or ultimatum. What would Carl Drega do if he were alive today?

And lastly, with your decision that you cannot support myself or my side, well, I support that decision -- for now. But let me inform you that sooner or later you will have no other choice other than to choose a side, and I hope that based upon our friendly relationship in the past that you will be on the side which shall survive, which is ours. The current criminal regime is a stupid and greedy one, and it has no thought, no plan for the future other than the parasitic one of continued spoliation over the masses of white-chicken Amerika. If you choose to stay in the mediocre middle you will in effect be caught in the crossfire. In the words of Jesus Christ, those who are not for us are against us, and we will accept no fence sitting from the Homer Simpsons of the mediocre middle. That is just the way it is.

My particular favorite section of the Bible deals with the interaction of the greatest of the Old Testament prophets, Elijah in his interactions with Ahab, Jezebel, the ruling elements of the state-god baal-priesthood, and the people of the Ten Tribes of Israel. I have lampooned the situation wherein today's events parallel that which happened 2800 years ago in one of my previous stories, [Last Kings, Chapter One](#). I look forward to further lampooning our sick amoral society with other similarities to the situation of today. But there is a grim side to Elijah's triumph over the House of Ahab and the baal-priesthood by raising Jehu to the throne. After Jehu's absolute destruction of the former regime and Jehu's reward of a four-generation dynasty, the brunt of God's wrath fell on the people, and the Israelites were destroyed and scattered as a people by the Assyrians. Sooner or later the people do pay for their acceptance of evil rulership.

But what do you think happened to the poor widows of these 10 Tribes during the time Elijah spent at the home of the Sidonian widow during the famine caused by the lack of rainfall as predicted by Elijah? If a Canaanite widow on the edge of the famine area was reduced to preparing to eat bark and then having her and her son die of starvation, what do you suppose happened to the Israelite widows and orphans who did not have God to provide for them through Elijah during the famine? Contrary to popular belief, then and now, the safest place to be is on the side of good and justice.

I can assure you that I do not have a death wish nor a desire for martyrdom. My only fear is that I shall die before my work is completed. I do not have a calling from God -- HE did not need to call for my assistance. In this day and age, a burning bush or a hallucination is unnecessary for the calling of HIS own. It is expected that those to whom much has been given should exercise their gifts without the need to be chased down, much less swallowed by a whale. The way should be clear to those who have clear vision; a broad path so obvious that the way of duty cannot be ignored or slighted.

You have been honest to me so far. You have given me no problem or grief so far. If you cannot continue with me, then I do indeed understand your balking, like Balaam's ass. But I seriously doubt that there is an angel of God in your path with a drawn sword, demanding that you stop. Rather it is a chimera drawn out of your social indoctrination by today's state-god baal-priesthood which tells you to stop, that you cannot go further, that you dare not even look past the mind's obstacles barring the path to the ford

over River Jordan.

But if you must stop, if you cannot continue, then go in peace, my brother, back to the apparent security of Moab like Orpah, Ruth's sister-in-law. I wish you a better fate than what befell Lot's wife, looking back at what was the pleasures of downtown Sodom, unable to face the grim realities of survival in the mountains. Still, the fate of Amerika, like that of Sodom, is understandable to anyone with an appreciation of reality given this solipsistic wastrel culture's affinity for evil and death. I think that sooner or later reality will scare you into activity, and that you have thus chosen by default to run for your life to a place of safety at a later date -- alone.

In any case, I have kept your identity anonymous. I do hope you will reconsider a parting of the ways. I am

Most Sincerely Yours,

[--Martin Lindstedt](#)

.



.

.

Copyright 1998. *The Modern Militiaman's Internet Gazette*

.



.

Back to [The Patriot Coalition?](#)

Back to [Patrick Henry On-Line](#)

.